

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

It was a bold venture on the part of President E. Y. MULLINS, D.D., LL.D., to challenge comparison with one of the greatest religious controversialists of our time by giving his recent book the title *Christianity at the Cross Roads* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net). It is just fifteen years since Father Tyrrell published his famous book, and President MULLINS thinks Christianity is still, or once more, at the Cross Roads. No doubt he is right, and his discussion is an able and comprehensive defence of evangelical Christianity.

Of evangelical Christianity, as he understands it; and, on the whole, as the late Principal Denney (whose name he always spells Denny) understood it. But there are others who would not be prepared to accept every argument of this book, and who would yet vigorously maintain that they too were evangelicals. We think, for example, of the late Professor A. B. Bruce who, in certain moods, would not have been inclined to endorse unhesitatingly what Dr. MULLINS says about the Virgin Birth; and yet Professor Bruce did as much as any man in recent times to create for the Church a living picture of Jesus, which has warmed and gladdened the hearts of the best of evangelicals.

But this, after all, is a side-issue. One merit of Dr. MULLINS' book is that he sees so clearly and proclaims so unambiguously where the real

issue lies. It is not a case of verbal inspiration or the infallibility of the Bible. Important as these things are to those who can accept them, they are as the small dust of the balance when weighed against the real interests that are at stake in the discussion. The question is, whether Jesus is merely the example or also the object of our faith: nay, the question is as to the very existence and possibility of religion itself. For the argument is that much of our current science and philosophy, if it were true, would leave room for nothing that the average sincere religious man would think it worth his while to identify with religion as he experiences it.

In the modern as in the ancient world Christianity has enemies: its enemies to-day are 'Science, Philosophy, Historical Criticism, and Comparative Religion.' It must not, however, for a moment be supposed that Dr. MULLINS is an obscurantist. He does not in the least object to these expressions of the human mind. He is too clear and sound a thinker not to see that they are inevitable, and that, in important respects, *e.g.* in their devotion to facts, and in their honest and patient endeavour to reach truth, their spirit and temper are admirable. He objects to them only when they go beyond their beat, and make dogmatic pronouncements on the subject of Religion, which, he justly argues, has an equal right with them to have its phenomena sympathetically treated.

Religious phenomena can only be adequately judged by those who have religious experience; and the error made by so many modern thinkers is, that the evidence is prejudged in advance on the basis of categories derived from some other field of experience and therefore strictly inapplicable here. A scientist, *e.g.*, whose investigations have led him to believe that the system of nature is closed, is pretty sure to apply this conception to his interpretation of extra-physical facts, with the result that he frequently leaves us with a God (if with a God at all) who is immanent but not transcendent, and with a human personality which has no freedom in the present, and no outlook for any future beyond death. Such science is hardly likely to do justice to the deep self-certifying experiences of religion.

Nor can Philosophy pronounce the final word: for the voices of Philosophy are too conflicting. 'What, after all, is Philosophy?' asks Professor Pratt in a passage quoted by Dr. MULLINS. 'Does it mean Hegel or Hume, Thomas Aquinas or Thomas Huxley? . . . If it come to a question of definite results, of problems surely solved and perplexing questions forever laid to rest, one must feel indeed somewhat chagrined. . . . We are about as far from knowing what Reality is as we ever were.'

No more can Historical Criticism by itself lead us into the deepest secret of the Christian Religion. That criticism is often conducted with a bias which deliberately ignores part of the evidence; as, *e.g.*, by Harnack when he makes the ethical element the thing of exclusive importance in the teaching of Jesus, or by Schweitzer who stresses the apocalyptic element in it, or by the champions of Comparative Religion, who would explain Christianity in terms of the religions contemporary with its origin. These all attempt 'to reduce Jesus Christ and the New Testament to smaller proportions than appear on the face of the record.'

And this leads Dr. MULLINS to the positive part of his discussion, with which he concludes. Here he presents 'the irreducible Christ' under four

aspects—as revealed in Christian experience, in the Jesus of the New Testament, in the larger spiritual life of the world, and in Christian history—and each phase of the argument goes to illustrate the incomparable place of Jesus as Revealer of God and Redeemer of men. God is indeed unchangeable—not unchangeable Law, but the unchangeable Father. Jesus is 'the effulgence of His glory, and the very image of His substance'; and man's deepest need is not education, but redemption through Him.

One of the biggest problems for the Church in our land is how to secure for a religious life and for the service of the Kingdom young men and women between the ages of fourteen and twenty. The importance of this problem lies on the surface of the facts. The future of the Church itself is bound up with it. If the Church goes on losing very many of the youth whom she has had in her Sunday schools, she thereby cripples herself and limits her influence. In addition to that, however, she is failing to solve the problem of the Outsider in the only way in which it can be solved. If the Church could keep the boys and girls she has in her schools, the question of the great outside 'lapsed mass' would solve itself.

The importance of the matter is, then, obvious. But its magnitude, or the magnitude of the facts, is not realized as it should be. It is difficult to secure statistics of a definite and reliable kind as to the actual numbers who lapse from Church ordinances after leaving Sunday school. It has been put as high as eighty per cent! That must be a decided exaggeration. But competent and sober observers put the number at about thirty per cent. And that is bad enough. It is probably under the truth, but let us take it at that. A steady loss of about a third of the boys and girls who are under the Church's care for nine years is a serious reflection on her methods.

What is the Church doing to provide a remedy?

There is a great deal of writing about the Church and the young just now. A few months ago, we reviewed here two books professing to deal with all the problems affecting this subject. As we pointed out, this special problem was very nearly ignored. Nearly all the writing and thinking are about the conduct of the Sunday school. And, of course, the Sunday school has its own contribution to make to the solution. A good Sunday school would lessen the pressure of the problem. But it would not solve it. If the school were ideal it would not prevent wholly, or nearly wholly, the drift away after school age.

After fourteen years of age (and often before it) forces and influences, physical and social, begin to play upon the youth with tremendous power. And these cannot be countered merely by preparation beforehand, though preparation is a great safeguard and a great help. But there must be more. There must be a definite concentration on this period by the right person and in the right way.

First of all the Church must realize that *this* is her most urgent task. That is not realized at present, and the fact accounts for the feeble way in which the matter is tackled. What is done for this critical age at present? For those below fourteen there is the school. For those of older years there is the Bible class. But for those from fourteen to eighteen or nineteen there is, at the best, what is called the 'Junior Bible Class.' This fills what is usually called the 'gap' between the school and the Bible class. This junior class is conducted by more or less competent people.

But it does not appeal to the adolescent youth. It is not *the* thing. The real thing is the Bible class conducted by the minister. And the junior class smacks still of the Sunday school. The minister, good man, is engaged in delivering to a motley class of all ages his second-hand impressions of Browning, or Dante, or 'the religion of the great poets,' or something else of the same momentous nature. And so the 'gap' is not really filled, not

always at least, and the fish slip through the meshes of the net.

What, then, is the real solution? It can be put in a few sentences, though the details have to be worked out in each case. The cure, or prevention, of the evil can be put in different ways. One way is to say that there should be no 'gap.' Another way of saying the same thing is that the minister ought to give up lecturing on Browning and Dante and address himself to his proper business, which is to keep hold of the young people who are emerging from the Sunday school. In other words, the Bible class should be, not for a miscellaneous collection of all sorts of people, but for the young people who are needing it most.

They are needing it most because they are at the age which needs guidance and control. They need it most because their minds and hearts are at the sensitive stage when good influences bite deep as well as bad. They need it most because it is just at this time they tend to drift away. Their need is great and (speaking generally) the minister is the only one who can meet it. They are prepared to be handled by him when they would not attend any one else. For them he is 'it,' and if he gives himself to them they will respond.

This means, of course, the construction of a scheme and also a great deal of personal pastoral care. As to the scheme, it means a careful organization of effort which will secure that no boy or girl is overlooked and that every one is personally followed up *by the minister*. This pastoral and careful tending will keep the fish from swimming off. And it will appeal to the young people themselves if it is done in a human way. The solution of the 'youth problem,' then, is the construction of a ladder from the Font to the Holy Table, or from the Font to the Altar, at every rung of which the young soul is carefully and lovingly shepherded.

But, supposing the young people are safely

shepherded into the Bible class, and the minister gives himself to this as his chief work, not allowing on any account any older people near his class, what then? It is then his business to give these young people a real course of instruction which will prepare them for Church membership. It ought to extend to four or five years and to include a year on the Old Testament (dealing with the big facts), a year on the New Testament, a year on the big facts of religion, and a year on the Church and the Sacraments.

These two things, the personal and human relation of the minister to the young at a sensitive and malleable age, and the definite instruction on proper lines, will solve the great problem if anything will. We plead for the recognition of the adolescent as the real task of the Church and for the concentration on him, with kindness and humanity, of the best the Church has to offer of pastoral care and mental interest and enrichment.

Readers of the *Hibbert Journal* for October will turn at once to the first article—'Jesus,' by Professor Kirsopp LAKE. Dr. LAKE's critical standpoint is sufficiently familiar from 'The Beginnings of Christianity.' It is what is generally known as 'negative.' He belongs to the extreme left wing of criticism. For this reason many who have read the work just referred to, as well as the 'Landmarks,' will naturally be interested to find out what the writer has to say constructively, or in the way of interpretation, about Jesus.

The article is disappointing. It is lacking in grip and in clear thinking. The writer is also too much inclined to undervalue both the character and the intelligence of those who hold views which he has rejected. There is a kind of arrogant dogmatism, also, on points about which the writer's judgment is at least open to question. 'Son of Man' he dismisses in a brief parenthesis ('which only means "Man"'). And Mark, we learn with surprise, 'only shows that Jesus was believed to

have become a "Son of God," possibly at the Baptism'—a quite extraordinary opinion.

Dr. LAKE begins by setting forth two propositions which contain the Catholic faith about Jesus. (1) God has a 'Son' or 'Logos' or 'Word' who is a definite person, distinct from the Father, but not another God. (2) This Son became human in Jesus. The evidence for both statements is St. John.

They are unsupported by the Synoptic Gospels. The Synoptists hold that Jesus *became* a Son of God at some period in His ministry. Their Christology is Adoptionism. Thus there are two conceptions of Jesus in the Gospels, that of St. John, which is the Incarnation doctrine, and that of the first three Gospels. But the historical character of St. John is now given up. Hence 'in plain language,' the central doctrine of the Catholic theology was unknown to Jesus and those disciples of Jesus who first recorded His life. 'I greatly doubt whether the youth of the next generation will be willing to accept the proposition that "the central doctrine of Christianity" is, and always must be, something which Jesus did not teach himself.'

The Logos doctrine was current in Greek circles, just as the Messiah doctrine was current in Jewish circles. That fact negatives the statement that the Johannine view was an inevitable inference made directly from Jesus' teaching and personality. The substance of the Logos doctrine came from Plato, and it was only used by those who were influenced by Greek thought.

There are only two alternatives. One is the Fundamentalist position about Scripture. If you accept that it settles the question. The other is the 'experimentalist' position. If the Church accepts this it will not require, as a condition of membership, that we should accept any opinion about Jesus, even His own. 'But it will certainly study what Jesus thought of himself, and if that appear doubtful, will regard with interest the possi-

bilities which critical judgment of the documents may suggest.'

What are these possibilities? Three are Jewish. (1) He was a prophet, (2) He was the Davidic Messiah, (3) He was the Son of Man who would come at the end of the world to judge the living and the dead. Two others are 'Gentile.' (4) He was the Lord of a sacramental cult which conferred Regeneration and Life through its Sacraments, and (5) He was the Incarnate Logos.

The first view was certainly held by Jesus. The fourth and fifth were not. He *may* have held the second or the third, though Dr. LAKE's judgment is against this conclusion. As to the Jewish views, whatever conclusion we come to is really unimportant. It does not matter at all what is the truth about them. They will rank with questions of Homeric theology to the student.

As to the 'Gentile' views, the sacramental doctrine is really Græco-Oriental. All these sacramental religions had a 'myth' or story of their own. And the distinction of the Christian myth, which tells of the Incarnation and Passion of a Divine Son of God, is that it contains far the nearest approach to history. But it belongs to a form of thought which is alien to that of the world to-day. It is different with the idea of Jesus as a prophet. The experimentalist will certainly rank Jesus among the great prophets of all history. He will not think that teaching is true because it is that of Jesus, but he will reverence Him because His teaching was in the main true and stands the test of experiment.

'In the main.' There is much in Jesus' teaching that we must discard. His eschatology, for example, and also His non-resistance doctrine. And, indeed, speaking generally, the experimentalist will give up the idea that modern problems are to be solved by the simple application of the teaching of Jesus. The religion of to-morrow will have to work out its problems in its own way without

trying to find a short cut in the teaching of Jesus or of any one else.

Such is the substance of this extraordinary essay. We have not much in hand by the end of it. Neither the religious nor the moral authority of Jesus is left to us. He is *un quantité négligeable*. The most amazing thing in the whole article is the writer's entire unconsciousness of anything out of the way in Jesus. He is evidently entirely and honestly oblivious of anything august or sublime in Jesus. Indeed, the annihilating criticism of Dr. LAKE's account of Jesus is that there is nothing left in Him to account in the least degree for the effects which notoriously He produced. Dr. LAKE's Jesus would not have stirred the waters in a provincial pond.

Further, Dr. LAKE does not see that to discard the term 'Logos' is not to discard the estimate of Jesus which St. John put in that intellectual form because it lay to his hand. St. John and St. Paul and St. Luke, as well as St. Mark (*pace* Dr. LAKE), came to their estimate of Jesus because of the facts. We do the same. We look at Himself. We read His tremendous claims—to forgive sin, to be the Judge of men, to be the object of the entire devotion of men's whole lives. We see His influence in history. We look at the testimony of Christian experience. These are the facts. The true experimentalist is the man who faces facts like these and does justice to them. And the Christian Church has, through the ages, found in the Catholic doctrine the only sufficient explanation of the facts.

The Bible is in some real sense a rule of faith and life, and in another sense it is not and cannot be a rule at all; for in it there are found conflicting rules. 'Answer not a fool according to his folly, lest thou also be like unto him.' And that sage advice is immediately countered by 'Answer a fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own conceit.' Which is right? Though in formal

contradiction, they are both right; and we must make room in our conduct for the application of both principles.

Again, 'Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ.' Right on the heels of that command comes the statement of the other law that 'each man shall bear his own burden.' Which is right? They are both right, and the second, no less than the first, is a 'law of Christ,' who bore His own burden as surely as He bore the burdens of other people.

Again, 'Enter into thy chamber, and shut thy door, and pray to thy Father who is in secret.' Religion is here a private transaction between the soul and God, and a man is to go about it almost as if he were doing a guilty thing. But on the other hand, we are not to 'forsake the assembling of ourselves together, as the custom of some is,' for there is a stimulus in religious companionship which cannot come from religious isolation. Which is right? They are both right: the one duty is as obligatory as the other.

Even in the words of our Lord such contradictory injunctions occur. For 'I say unto you, Love your enemies.' But it was He who also said, 'If any man cometh unto me, and *hateth* not his own father, and mother, and wife, and children, he cannot be my disciple.' What a paradox—that we should love our enemies, and yet hate our parents and children!

The existence of such contradictions and paradoxes in Holy Scripture has a profound religious value, for they drive us, if we think at all, beyond the letter to the spirit. They show us how impossible it is for us to rest in isolated words which may only be half-truths or rather truths which, if our life and thinking are to be conducted in a large and generous way, have to be complemented and balanced by other truths. They make us think of life in a big way, as not to be interpreted by any single formula, or indeed by a formula at all, but

by a principle which seeks to express itself now in this way, now in that, but always inadequately. Life is too big a thing to be compassed by any single law, except it be the royal law of love which, well considered, is strictly not a law at all.

When we thus rise from the letter to the spirit, we shall be the less perturbed by the contradictions—and they are not few—among the historical statements of the Bible. The Lord, we are told in Samuel, moved David to number Israel; but we are just as explicitly told by the Chronicler that it was Satan who moved him. Doubtless these are just two different interpretations of the same act: they are not so much contradictory statements of fact as contradictory interpretations of fact. Still, they *are* contradictory: and nothing is gained by closing our eyes to a thing so obvious. The contradiction is there, whether we refuse to look at it or not.

Sometimes, indeed, the contradictions extend to statements of fact: sometimes even a writer contradicts his own statements. The historian who tells us that Asa removed the high places (2 Ch 14⁵) tells us in the very next chapter that he did not remove them (15¹⁷), and he gives us the same conflicting accounts of Jehoshaphat's attitude to the high places (17⁶ 20³³). Criticism has a simple solution of these contradictions, but though it can explain them, it cannot remove or explain them away.

The Gospels themselves are full of such perplexities. Mark tells of the healing of a blind man, as Jesus was leaving Jericho, but according to Luke he is approaching Jericho, and according to Matthew there are two blind men. Even in words so important and, one would imagine, so well known as the superscription on the Cross, the tradition is not uniform.

What does it all mean? Does it not mean that we must learn to think of the Bible, as of life, in a big way? The literary facts are such that the

doctrine of verbal inspiration is simply untenable. God will not have us rest in any worship of the letter. But is that a loss? Nay, rather, it is a glorious gain. For we are driven by these discrepancies into the region of the spirit, where such things matter nothing at all.

They matter, of course, to the historian and the literary critic. In certain cases they may even matter immensely to them. It is through patient and vigilant attention to such things that it has become possible to detect the sources underlying our present narratives, to trace the reaction upon them of varying types of mind, and so to understand, better than ever before, the real course of events and the real development of mind alike in Israel and in the early Church.

But most of us are neither historians nor literary

critics. We are, or strive to be, religious men, whose business is to walk not by the letter which killeth, but by the spirit which giveth life. What we are concerned with is to capture, if we can, the faith by which those men of the olden times lived—their faith in God's gracious purpose for the world and for themselves, that faith which shines through all they wrote for those who have eyes to look beyond possible historical inaccuracies to the radiant purpose which inspired and controlled their story.

In the paradoxes and contradictions of Scripture there lies, as we have said, a positive religious value. They bring us out of the stifling atmosphere of barren logomachies into a 'large place' where there is room to breathe. They oblige us to shake off our bondage to the letter, and to stand upon our feet, emancipated men, who rejoice in the liberty wherewith Christ made us free.

St. Andrew's Day Sermon.¹

BY THE REVEREND PROFESSOR J. F. MCFADYEN, M.A., KINGSTON, ONT., CANADA.

'Now the Lord said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto the land that I will shew thee: and I will make of thee a great nation.'—Gn 12¹.

1. OUR text tells us that this Abraham was an emigrant, one who had been called by God to leave his country. The new drama required a new stage. A new chapter in the training of mankind, a chapter big with import, was about to begin. Abraham and his descendants were to pass through a long and stern course of discipline. But first there must be an absolute break from the old associations. The new teaching cannot flourish in the old soil. The new wine requires new bottles.

The writer 'to the Hebrews' draws a beautiful and touching picture of Abraham's great act of faith: how, when God's call came to him, he obeyed and went out from his native land, not knowing whither he went, knowing nothing save that God was calling him. Though he was living in the

land of promise, yet he lived in it as a foreigner and a stranger. He and his might have gone back to their old home; yet they saw the glory dimly and afar off, and believed they were where they were because God so willed it. They lived the weary, restless life of the dweller in tents, here to-day and gone to-morrow, now pitching and now striking their tents; yet all the time they were looking for a city, a city where they might rest, a city with houses and walls and solid foundations, all planned and built by God. The Hebrews believed it was at a great price, the price of exile, that the fathers of their race had won for them their inheritance. The Old Testament is in large measure a book of exiles. Think for a moment of the precious treasure of story and of psalm, of prophecy and prayer, of which the world would have been robbed had there been no exile in Egypt, no exile in Babylon. In the story of Israel it was true, as it is so often true, that they learned in suffering what they taught in song.

¹ Preached in St. Andrew's Church, Toronto.

Doubtless the people who saw this trek into Egypt saw in it nothing but a party of emigrants squeezed out of their homes, or seeking better conditions of living in a new land, or leaving their country in search of adventure. But the Hebrew mind, which had a wonderful faculty for piercing into the truth of things, saw in this movement the hand of God. The people of this continent are emigrants or the children of emigrants. Did we and our fathers just happen to come here, or shall we say that God called us from our country because He had a mission for us? We sometimes call Canada 'God's own country.' But no country is God's country, save as we make it so. One Hebrew tradition saw in the arrival at Canaan an improvement in their own social position, saw in the land of their adoption 'a land of wheat, and barley, and vines, and fig-trees, and pomegranates; a land of olives and honey; a land wherein thou shalt eat bread without scarceness, thou shalt not lack any thing in it.' But even in that same tradition there was a solemn warning lest their hearts should be lifted up and they should forget the Lord their God. And a great prophet arose to the conception that Israel's true destiny was not to enjoy but to suffer, and in her suffering to become the servant of mankind. If Canada or any land is to become God's own country, it must be for some better reason than the creature comforts we find in her.

2. But Abraham was called on to leave, not only his country, but also his kindred and his father's house. As the Israelites conceived it, the forward march of the world was to be at the cost to Abraham of separation from kith and kin. That is the pang of progress. Some nations seem born to be the leaders of mankind, whether in commerce or colonization, or in the things of the spirit. And their leadership means that their young men go forth generation after generation leaving behind them those who love them more than life. It is not only in the sphere of missionary enterprise that Western courage and inspiration, Western knowledge, experience, and skill, have been freely placed at the disposal of the Orient and of Africa. But we sometimes forget how often Western services to other continents have been rendered by men and women at whose hearts was gnawing the dull pain of longing for loved ones in the far-off homeland.

We, too, the sons of Scotland, belong to a race that has known more than most, how wide the world is and how bitter are its partings. It is no

accident that the Scottish song which, almost more than any other, has captured the heart of mankind, is a song of reunion after long years of separation. Burns found 'Auld Lang Syne' a stave of stupid and bacchanalian revelry. He added two verses and made it one of the sweetest and saddest songs in any language. Who that has a heart at all has not been moved almost to tears, as he sang those haunting words that tell of the returned emigrants' wistful looking back to the dear and happy friendships of childhood, long since sundered and never to be quite re-knit:

We twa hae run aboot the braes,
And pu'd the gowans fine;
But we've wandered mony a weary foot,
Sin' auld lang syne.
We twa hae paidled i' the burn,
Frae mornin' sun till dine;
But seas between us braid hae roared,
Sin' auld lang syne.

That is the price a nation with a world destiny has to pay for its greatness. Far more to-day than when these words were written, do they come home to the heart of the Scottish people. Since Burns' time, Scotland has seen more than a century of colonization and commercial expansion, of foreign political responsibilities and missionary enterprise. These have carried her sons and daughters from her shores by the ten thousand till now there can hardly be a household in the land that has not its exiles. With full hearts to-night we join in spirit with our brethren who in many a strange and far-off quarter of God's world, sometimes in little groups, sometimes in large gatherings, but always with pride and enthusiasm, are this week sparing a little from their other pursuits to think of the dear little land in the North Sea that was once their home or the home of their fathers; to thank God for His great goodness to her and to breathe a prayer for her welfare.

3. But Abraham's call was not merely to leave his country and his kindred, but to go out into a land that God would show him. The land into which Abraham was going was unknown to him; it was not unknown to God; his future was dark to him, but God had it all mapped out; God knew the way he was taking. There were dark moments in the history of Israel when it seemed as if God had forgotten them, as if the hand of God was against them. There were times when the saints of Israel felt they had to reason

with God, to remonstrate with Him, when the heathen seemed to have right on their side as they cried: 'Where is now your God?' But God always vindicated Himself, and as we look back on the story, can we not say of every part of it: 'He hath done all things well'? Truly they were in a land that God had shown them. All the way God was guiding them and teaching them, and men to this day turn for inspiration to Jewish psalm and Jewish prophecy.

Can we imagine any faith that will so deliver us from all pettiness, so enrich our thought of ourselves and exalt our standards, as just this faith that it was God who called us from our home, that we are in a land that He has shown us, that for us as a people God has a mission? The history of our people has been a chequered history. We have known victory and defeat, sunshine and shadow, poverty and plenty, civil achievement and civil disaster; but through it all can we not say that in the long run we have not shut God out of our national life; that, however feebly and mistakenly, we have on the whole acknowledged God, and God has abundantly directed our ways?

Perhaps we have dwelt too much in the Old Testament and too little in the New, but the Old Testament has appealed to us. We have loved the psalms with their strength and their tenderness, their sense of the unseen, their wrestling with God, their triumph over doubt and despair. We not only love the psalms, but we have found the Gospel in them, the Gospel of God's redeeming love. Our sturdy forefathers have afforded mirth to many because they had an instinctive dislike of hymns. At last in the seventies of last century they were induced to allow hymns in their worship.

The Hymn-book survived for nearly a generation when it was replaced by the Scottish Hymnary. For a number of years now, there have been grumblings about the Scottish Hymnary, and proposals to revise it. My edition of Hymns of Praise I notice is dated 1918. Perhaps from twenty to thirty years may be taken as the period of the effective life of a hymn-book, but the psalms live on. The psalms were not written by chronic invalids, as so many of our hymns seem to have been.

One thing that endears the Old Testament to the Scottish people is the atmosphere it breathes of being the book of a Highland people. Like the

saints of the Old Testament, we have learned what our hills can do for us and what they cannot do. Few psalms have gone home to the heart of the Scottish people like the 121st:

I to the hills will lift mine eyes,
from whence doth come mine aid.
My safety cometh from the Lord,
who heav'n and earth hath made.
Thy foot he'll not let slide, nor will
he slumber that thee keeps.
Behold, he that keeps Israel,
he slumbers not, nor sleeps.

Yes, our hills are not an invincible protection against our enemies. In the long run our safety comes from the Lord who made heaven and earth. Yet the hills are God's, and under God our hills have often guarded us from our enemies. And the same hills that shut us out from our enemies, shut us in with God. The dwellers on the hills are so familiar with big things that they can hardly themselves be small. As Sir George Adam Smith once said: 'No Highland people can ever be vulgar.' It was a true instinct that made our Lord climb when He was going to announce for all time the programme of the Kingdom of God.

So far as we can judge ourselves, we put in the very forefront of Scotland's message to mankind the old, old command: 'Six days shalt thou labour and do all thy work, but the seventh day is a Sabbath unto the Lord thy God.' As a people we make no claim to genius or to any but the humble virtues; but these two things we believe our past history has taught us and through us may teach others: the daily work, the Sabbath rest and worship.

We, the sons of Scotland, gladly acknowledge that our fathers were workers. There are few more honourable parts of our inheritance than the tradition of hard, conscientious toil, the toil that gives us the right to hold up our heads, as we walk among our fellows, with the consciousness that we have made good our claim to a place in the great human brotherhood. And now we see the traditional Scottish conception of life challenged, challenged not so much in word as in the whole attitude of multitudes. Half-consciously men have gone back to the old idea that work is a curse. Man's chief end, we are told, is to have a good time, and work is a disagreeable necessity which must be hurried through to get at the amusement which is the real thing.

There are multitudes to-day making a great and perilous experiment, trying to see what they can make of their lives without ever having prepared for them, without having acquired those habits of disciplined service whose absence makes leisure and plenty a continual snare. It may be that our fathers were inclined to make a fetish of work, to forget that the charm, the beauty, the joy of life can never be ours unless we make room for them. Yet the world is made not for idlers but for toilers. Our Lord Himself sometimes had hardly leisure for a meal, snatched with difficulty the necessary time for rest and prayer. When He wished to find a suitable picture to convey some lesson about the Kingdom it was to a worker He turned. The Kingdom of Heaven is like a farmer, like a fisherman, like a vinedresser, a trader, a pearl merchant, in some way or other like a man doing useful work in the world. It is only when Jesus wants to picture a fool that He takes an idler as His model—a farmer who has had a bumper crop, and can think of no better use for it than to store it in huge new barns and retire on the proceeds to a life of self-indulgence. Is it not in the very forefront of the message that the Scottish people have for mankind, that work is no curse but the discipline by which our Heavenly Father, our great Teacher, fits us for life and our immortal destiny?

The command of the six days' work is accompanied by the other command of the seventh day's rest, a command not only of a rest but of a holy rest, a rest unto the Lord. There are few institutions in the Scottish national life which our critics have found more amusing than the Scottish Sunday, and surely there are few of which we have less reason to be ashamed. To one who has lived for years in a non-Christian country, it is a great experience to come back and renew one's acquaintance with the Scottish Sunday: to note the noisy pursuit of mammon and pleasure stilled for a day, the quiet of the streets, the clang from many a steeple, harsh, perhaps, to a foreign ear but with a music of its own to those who understand; to see the well-dressed throngs making their way to the house of God, to join in the Shepherd psalm, or 'O God of Bethel' with those who have inherited the same traditions as ourselves, to hear God's word expounded with sense and reverence.

We need each other in our worship; need each other as we thank our Father for our common

blessings, ask His forgiveness for our common sins, and His help in our common temptations. Have we not all known what it is, in some great Christian congregation, to join in one of the Church's hymns of praise to God, to find our hearts swelling with a new gratitude, to find new wonders in God's love, because we had caught a spark from the great fire of love and gratitude that was all around us?

Our fathers were right. We cannot live without God. God has been very good to the Scottish people, and we have some qualities that make for worldly success; but if as a people we have achieved anything that was worth achieving, it was surely at least in part, because we have never imagined that the material things of life are the whole of life, because our fathers taught us to pierce beneath the show of things and to see the invisible, taught us above the hoarse cries of the battlefield, or the shrill bartering of the marketplace, to hear the still small voice.

Our religion is too cheap in our day. In the early days of my ministry, in the closing prayer of the service, I used almost automatically to add the petition: 'Take us to our homes in safety.' One day I heard a young lady member of my congregation speak jestingly of this petition. Till then I had never seen the full force of it. The congregation with which, as a child, I had worshipped, had inherited the traditions of the Covenanters, among their other traditions this petition: 'Take us to our homes in safety,' a tradition born of the days when men did not worship God in snug pews, but stole out singly or in little groups to the hillside and posted sentinels while they worshipped, never knowing, as they praised God, whether they would ever see their homes again. The tradition of our Sabbath rest and our Sabbath worship has come to us stained with blood and dimmed with many a tear. Surely for our people, of all people in the world, the first day of the week should be a Sabbath to the Lord our God.

Burns' cotter lived a life that to most of us would seem repellent, perhaps even sordid, with its tiny cottage, its homely fare, its poverty and drab monotony, the children working for hire as farm drudges. And yet it is not only to the poet's eye that life was greatly lived even in that humble home. For there was love:

With joy unfeign'd brothers and sisters meet,
An' each for other's weelfare kindly spiers:

The laughter of little children was there :

Th' expectant wee-things, toddlin', stacher through
To meet their dad, wi' flichterin' noise an' glee.

The farmer and his family toiled and were not
ashamed :

The toil-worn Cotter frae his labour goes,
This night his weekly moil is at an end,
Collects his spades, his mattocks, and his hoes,
Hoping the morn in ease and rest to spend,
And, weary, o'er the moor, his course does hameward
bend.

The labourer's cottage, lowly as it was, was a home :

His wee bit ingle, blinkin' bonnilie,
His clean hearth-stane, his thrifty wife's smile,
The lispin' infant prattling on his knee,
Does a' his weary carking care beguile,
An' makes him quite forget his labour an' his toil.

Yes, and God was there :

The cheerfu' supper done, wi' serious face
They round the ingle form a circle wide ;
The sire turns o'er, wi' patriarchal grace,
The big ha'-Bible, ance his father's pride ;
His bonnet rev'rently is laid aside,
His lyart haffets wearing thin an' bare ;
Those strains that once did sweet in Zion glide,
He wales a portion with judicious care ;
And ' Let us worship God ! ' he says, with solemn
air.

' From scenes like these,' says Burns, ' old
Scotia's grandeur springs, that makes her lov'd at
home, rever'd abroad.' Yes, and the sons of
Scotland will still be great as God counts greatness
wherever they surround themselves with scenes like
these.

Literature.

THE CHURCH AND HISTORY.

THREE books have just appeared dealing in different ways with the same point. One is *The Preaching of Christ*, edited, and partly written, by Dr. T. R. Glover (Kingsgate Press ; 2s. 6d. net and 1s. 6d. net). It consists of addresses delivered at the Annual Assembly of the Baptist Union. Dr. Glover (he is entitled 'M.A.' on the front page, but surely he is more ?) was president of the Union, and delivered an address on 'Turning-Points in Christian History,' which was followed by eight other addresses by selected men who had previously met in conference to talk over the subject. Dr. Glover's own contribution has all the qualities which make his writing so suggestive and informing. He selects four great crises in the Church's history when it was saved from danger by the appearance of a God-sent man, and he points out the lessons we can learn from these occasions. The men suggest the situation. They were St. Paul, Augustine, Luther, and Wesley. Dr. Glover points out that all of them were men of scholarship, and he says very plainly that the Church will never experience a revival if scholarship and science are ignored or refused. But he draws wider lessons for the Church of to-day. He sees in these four men experiences which have to be repeated in us, first a recognition

of the power of evil, then a vision of the deliverance in Christ, and finally the central place of the Cross. The rest of the addresses hammer in these nails.

The second book is the Fernley Lecture for 1924, *Early Christianity and its Message to the Modern Church*, by the Rev. R. Martin Pope, M.A. (Epworth Press ; 5s. net). This also is an appeal to history. The writer traces certain fundamental characteristics of the early faith, then describes the challenge which this early faith threw down to its environment, and finally shows what Christianity was on the different sides of its life, in worship, in belief, in ordinary existence, in the army and under persecution. At each stage of his argument he stops to indicate the parallels with the modern time and the lessons we have to learn from the early days of Christianity. The historical part of the book is well done. It is based on real knowledge, and, if we find the brush on the big side and the painting broad, and a trifle vague in its effects, this is hardly to be wondered at with so much to be shown on a restricted canvas. The ordinary reader will learn a great deal about the pagan surroundings of Christianity and of what it meant in these days to be a Christian. In his final chapter, 'The Message of the First Three Centuries to the Modern Church,' the writer selects three points, Simplicity, Self-Renunciation, and Service, and he has a good deal

to say on these points that is of value to his modern readers. The book as a whole is a very creditable piece of that sort of scholarship which is awake to the significance for all time of historical instances.

The third of the books referred to above is the twenty-fourth Hartley Lecture, on *The International Value of Christian Ethics*, by the Rev. William Younger (Holborn Publishing House; 5s. net). The author is concerned to vindicate the place of Christianity as a decisive factor in the solution of all national and international problems. His range is wider than Mr. Pope's. He reviews the Old Testament period and has no difficulty in finding a basis for a wide international view in Isaiah and Jeremiah. This leads on to a helpful delineation of the teaching of Jesus and of St. Paul, always with the widest outlook in view. This is followed by a rapid review of the place Christianity has had, and the influence it has exerted, all down the centuries; and finally on this foundation, well and truly laid, the writer makes his own contribution dealing with the Christian Ethic in Nationalism, in Individualism, and in Internationalism. There is a good deal of forcible thinking in the book and a sound knowledge of the sources. The author has no difficulty in showing that the only hope of the world lies in the gospel and the spirit of Christ, and, if the task was easy, it has been discharged with a great deal of ability. The book would have been more effective with fewer quotations. "

JEWISH LIFE AND THOUGHT.

The writer who calls himself Benammi has followed up his 'Aspects of Jewish Life and Thought,' published two years ago, by another series of delightful *Essays on Jewish Life and Thought* (Longmans; 10s. 6d. net). These deal briefly, but interestingly and often pungently, with all sorts of things and people—diet and cremation, music and art, business and kindness to animals, Popes and Messiahs, Mr. H. G. Wells and Trotsky and Lord Sydenham. One cannot read these striking essays without realizing afresh the essential greatness as well as the persistence of the Jewish people. How much they have done for the world, and how much they have suffered at its hands! How wise and kind and generous the greatest of them have been! The writer is not far from the mark in maintaining that there are indications in many directions that a public opinion on religious and social questions is

growing up which is approximating more and more to the Jewish view,' and that 'the principle underlying the League of Nations itself may justly be claimed as being of Jewish origin.'

The chequered experience of the Jews as they moved down the centuries, for the most part despised and rejected of men, is vividly reflected in these pages: we see them as thinkers, as musicians, as military heroes, above all as religious men who have clung through exile and cruel persecution to hope and to God. The book yields many an interesting glimpse into the thoughtful Jewish mind. In discussing Education, we are reminded, for example, that in early times no teacher was allowed to have more than twenty-five children in his class. Again, 'there is nothing inherently un-Jewish in cremation,' and a good Jew of whom the writer tells rejected the belief in immortality, without, he thinks, being the less a Jew for that. The Jews are not behind the Bolshevistic movement: Trotsky is the exception that proves the rule; and so on.

There are very few, but there are one or two, statements which a Christian would instinctively query. 'Innocent little children,' we are told, 'by being taught the New Testament, are inoculated with the virus of Jew hatred.' Whatever may be true of the Continent, that surely does not apply to Britain. But the book, as a whole, is the expression of a generous and finely cultured spirit, and not only Jewish readers will be instructed and refreshed by it.

WHAT THINK YE OF CHRIST?

In *The Christ of the Logia* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net), Professor A. T. Robertson of Kentucky makes one more addition to his astonishing output of theological literature. Many of the essays in this volume have already appeared in magazines. The book has the characteristics with which Dr. Robertson's many readers are familiar. On the one hand, with reference to the text, he accepts critical methods with some at least of the critical results. On the other hand, in theological matters and questions of Introduction, he is a staunch defender of conservative positions. Among the subjects on which he adheres to traditional beliefs are the Virgin Birth, the physical resurrection of Jesus, the raising of Lazarus, the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel, and (with more quali-

fication) the Johannine authorship of 'Revelation.' In the essays which give the title to the volume, Professor Robertson tries to establish that the same position is accorded to Jesus in the different strata of the Gospel record.

There is a characteristic discussion of 'The Life of Christ in Mark's Gospel in the Light of the World War,' representing teaching given to candidates for war work during the war years. The following illustrations of his method will suffice: "The Peril of Listening." Mk 4²¹⁻²⁵. Light brings responsibility. It cannot be shirked. America could not stop her ears to the cry of Belgium, France, Britain, and Serbia. For very shame's sake we had to respond, and for our own safety also.' Under the heading 'Jesus Lord of Life and Death' (Mk 4³⁵⁻⁴¹), the author claims that, while one-fourth of the men called under the first (American) draft law were disqualified by venereal disease, as a result of the measures adopted the United States 'sent overseas the cleanest lot of men alive.'

It is unnecessary to say that the book is everywhere scholarly, earnest, and courteous.

UNIVERSAL RESTORATION.

The problems connected with the future state seem to have a strong attraction for this generation. Among the many books recently written on this subject not a few incline to the belief in conditional immortality. But the latest contribution takes a different line. In *The Goodness and the Severity of God*, a recent Hulsean Lecture, by the Rev. J. O. F. Murray, D.D., Master of Selwyn College, Cambridge (S.C.M.; 5s. net), the writer argues strongly for the doctrine of universal restoration. His positions are that the revealed purpose of God is the salvation of men and that this purpose is wrought out by probation. Yet the Bible makes an absolute distinction between the saved and the lost. How are these truths to be reconciled? The traditional method waters down the plain affirmation in Scripture of the certain victory of Good, and tries to limit the number of the lost. This is unfaithful to the Bible. Others, like Martensen, on the other hand, simply say, 'we can't reconcile the two sides.' Dr. Murray has written his book to show that they can be reconciled. The distinction between saved and lost, though absolute, is not final. The 'age' in which man's destiny is being wrought out is the present, and in this period the

shadows still abide. But the true light will appear and shine them all away.

This summary does not do any justice at all to the strength of the writer's reasoning or to the moral seriousness of his attitude to sin. Retribution has a deadly meaning to him, and sin's punishment is a terrible thing. Only it is not unending. The pages in which Dr. Murray contends against the idea of God as the author of a purely vindictive hell are full of an earnestness which must impress the reader. Perhaps the best part of the book is the closing section, in which the writer answers the plea that his doctrine is dangerous. But, whether we agree with him or no, such a work as Dr. Murray has produced will help to elucidate one of the most serious problems of the faith, and ought to be widely considered.

THE BIBLE IN SCOTS LITERATURE.

Dr. Moffatt has given us another proof of his range and versatility in *The Bible in Scots Literature* (Hodder & Stoughton; 10s. 6d. net). The discussion covers five centuries, from the fourteenth to the nineteenth, concluding, very properly, with Scott, and its aim is to trace the influence of the Bible upon the choice of subjects by Scots authors, and upon their treatment and style. Dr. Moffatt reminds us that the presence of Biblical allusions is no guide to the religious, still less to the literary, quality of the pieces in which they occur: still the quest is worth while for its own sake, and reveals the extent to which among readers a knowledge even of the more recondite parts of the Bible, including the Apocrypha, is presupposed.

In an interesting introduction Dr. Moffatt shows to what this knowledge of the Bible was due—to pictures, religious plays, and not least to preaching. Familiar names appear, from Blind Harry and Barbour to Burns and Scott, but most of the names are relatively unfamiliar; and one of the many merits of the book is that Dr. Moffatt furnishes his readers with copious excerpts from the—to most readers—rather inaccessible literature he is discussing. Dunbar is 'the first really great Scots poet,' and in Dr. Blair's criticisms we come upon 'the beginning of literary appreciation of the Bible in our literature.' *Dicta* like these serve as finger-posts to a discussion which is crowded with interesting and often quaint detail, and we are made to feel the part which literature and the Bible played

in Scotland's great struggles, first with England, and then with Rome. Most readers will welcome the full and illuminating treatment which has been given to Burns and Scott, those great figures who in their appreciation of the Bible, as in so much else, are representative of the genius of their country. Many will also welcome the book as much for its revelation of the quality and variety of Scots literature as for its convincing exhibition of the influence of the Bible on that literature. Sir David Lyndsay's plea for the use of the vernacular is typical of the interesting excerpts in which the book abounds.

He [*i.e.* Moses] wrote the Law, on tables hard of stone,

In their own vulgar language of Hebrew,
That all the bairns of Israel, every one,

Might know the Law and so the same ensw
[carry out].

Hid he done write in Latin or in Grew [Greek]
It had to them been but a sowreless [tasteless]
jest :

Ye may well wit [know] God wrocht all for the best.

ROMAN CATHOLIC SCHOLARSHIP.

Volume four of *The Westminster Version of the Sacred Scriptures* has appeared (Longmans; 5s. net, paper covers). It is 'a new translation from the original Greek and Hebrew texts.' The present volume includes Hebrews, the Pastoral and Johannine letters, James, Peter (both letters), and Jude. The first section of the book contains introductions to the several letters. Then follow the translation and notes. And finally we have two appendices, one of some length on the important question (all-important to Roman Catholics) of 'the Brethren of the Lord.' It may be said at once that the translation is throughout excellent. One instance will show this. The great promise in Hebrews, 'I will never leave thee nor forsake thee,' is rendered, 'I will never abandon or desert thee,' which is better than any translation known to us, bringing out the exact shade of meaning of the two words.

One turns with interest to the introductions, and here our experience is not so happy. It is not merely that the traditional Church conclusions are reached in each case (Hebrews and the Pastorals are all by St. Paul, all the Johannine letters by St.

John, Second Peter is as genuine as First, and so on). It is the conventional form of the reasoning that gives an impression of unreality. In regard to Hebrews, *e.g.*, the writer states the different views, and adds, 'the Biblical Commission in a decree given June 24th, 1914, teaches that the Epistle to the Hebrews is to be included among the genuine letters of St. Paul, emphasizing the weight of tradition and of the internal evidence in its favour;' but (with due deference to any further decision of the Church) allows the view that the form of the Epistle (that is, the language in which the thoughts are clothed) may be due to another.' This is the old cliché of 'different secretaries,' which is made to do duty later on also in explaining the differences between First and Second Peter. The writer of the introduction to the Pastorals has the courage to adduce the 'style and vocabulary' (the one really serious difficulty in the way of the Pauline authorship) as an argument in its favour. What difference there is from other letters of St. Paul he accounts for by the fact that the theme and the whole subject-matter are novel. Perhaps one should not expect anything different, when authority has settled the matter. But these writers evidently know at least some of the literature of criticism (J. B. Mayor and Hastings' 'Dictionary' are quoted), and one might expect more thorough work, if the books were to be introduced at all. The printing of the translation is excellent, and (apart from the paper covers) the book is well got up.

JESUS CHRIST AND THE HUMAN QUEST.

In *Jesus Christ and the Human Quest* (Abingdon Press; \$3.00 net), Professor Edwin Lewis of the Drew Theological Seminary, New Jersey, has given us a book of quite unusual interest and power. Its sub-title is: 'Suggestions toward a Philosophy of the Person and Work of Christ.' In books like this dogmatic theology comes to its own as the most vital of all subjects of human discussion. The writer takes a wide view of his subject, and tries to show the significance of Christ before discussing His person and work. This he does, in the first place, by analysing the essential characteristics of man, which analysis yields the result that in religion alone has man found the clue to the total meaning of his life and experience. The

text of much of the book is thus expressed: 'Since the world comes to its supreme expression in man, and since man comes to his supreme expression in moral goodness, and since there is nothing that happens to a man or is done by him which may not be used to promote moral goodness, therefore moral goodness in personality is the highest conceivable value and as such is the clue to the meaning of existence.' The problem therefore is to define the character of that goodness, and it is here that the writer finds the significance of Jesus.

The spirit in which the book is written is indicated in the author's statement that by 'What think ye of Christ?' he understands 'What will ye do with Christ?' In the course of the discussion we meet many old controversies and some more recent. Whether the subject be the existence of God, evolution, personality, or the millennial hope, whether it be pragmatism, sin, the Atonement, or the Trinity, everywhere the reader feels that he is under the guidance of one who has read widely, thought deeply, and felt keenly. Even those who do not in every detail accept the standpoint of the author will acknowledge that the book is Christian through and through. Many a reader who has felt as if his creed were slipping from him, will learn afresh as he studies this book that the Christian Church is founded on a rock. The old 'articles' will come home to him with power because they are transfigured when seen in the light of the new knowledge and thought of our day.

Not that Professor Lewis overvalues creeds; he knows that the only creed which is more than a form of words follows the Christian experience rather than precedes it. 'Let God be conceived as the Eternal Spirit of Sacrificial Love from which all things proceed, and let Jesus be conceived as One who absolutely manifested that Spirit under the conditions of a human life, and all the practical and religious and philosophical value of the idea and fact of incarnation may be retained without entailing the burden of an outworn and impossible metaphysic.' The Apostolic Church, in its attempt to express what it found in Jesus, may have used formulas that do not mean very much to the thought of our own day; but its experience of Jesus is the experience of Him that every age has in which the Church is a vital, effective force. If we understand the matter aright, we can still say that Jesus Christ is 'The

Eternal Son of God,' 'the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever.'

The clear trenchant style makes the book as quotable as its living thought makes it preachable. We know hardly any volume more helpful to the preacher who wishes to explain to intelligent people the meaning, the claims, and the demands of the Christian religion in the light of modern thought. A careful and critical bibliography adds greatly to the value of the work.

A reprint has been called for of *The Essentials of Religion*, by Dr. J. Wilson Harper. The book was noticed in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES on its publication last year. The present volume is issued at 3s. 6d. net, with paper boards (Allen & Unwin).

A third and revised edition of *The Ministry of the Holy Ghost*, by Mrs. James Gow, has just been issued by Messrs. Allenson, Limited (1s. 6d. net). The book contains three addresses: 'Christ's Teaching concerning the Holy Ghost,' 'The Holy Ghost as Essential to Spiritual Progress,' 'The Holy Ghost the Source of Personal Holiness.'

A very interesting and edifying discourse on *Man in the Making* is issued in the form of a booklet at the small cost of fourpence (Appleyard, Middlesbrough). The writer is the Rev. E. S. G. Wickham, and there is a great deal in his little book that is valuable.

A charming little missionary story for boys or girls has been written by Mary Entwistle. The name is *Habeeb: A Boy of Palestine*. There are some etchings by A. M. Elverson, and a coloured frontispiece by Elsie A. Wood (Church Missionary Society; 2s. net).

The late Rev. George Gardiner, D.D., was for many years minister of Kirknewton. As a fitting memorial of his long, faithful, and gracious ministry there, eighteen of his sermons have been picked out and published with the title *The Books were Opened* (R. & R. Clark; 4s. net). The sermons chosen were not those delivered on any special occasion, but are just what Dr. Gardiner preached Sunday after Sunday. They are clear, simple, and

devout. The volume is prefaced by a short memoir of the author by the Rev. Emeritus Professor John Patrick, D.D., LL.D.

Every one knows that the great Indian epics, the Ramayana and Mahabharata, are books one ought to read. And yet of those who, lured to them by their fame, have set out hopefully and full of ardour into these wide fields, how many have won through to the farther end? Probably enough they journeyed a far distance. For beauty spots have a trick of suddenly appearing just when the tired mind is thinking upon turning back; and, heartened, it plods on. Yet the length is so immense, and much of the way lies through such dry and sterile places, that it is a very little company that reaches the goal. For those who gave it up, and who have felt uneasy over their failure, here is a serviceable book, *Myths and Legends of India*, by the Rev. J. M. Macfie, M.A. (T. & T. Clark; 8s.). For the author knows all the green oases, and can guide you to them without any irritating waste of time. There is, moreover, an interesting and informing introduction, and sufficient notes.

This is an age of hustle. But to polish off *The World's Living Religions* (T. & T. Clark; 7s.), whole eleven of them, in a little work of less than three hundred pages, leaves one a little rushed and breathless and dizzy in the brain. Yet Dr. R. E. Hume has to be taken seriously. By study, by travelling, by first hand research, he has gained the right to speak: and his book condenses much into small compass with real skill. It has of course its dangers. A signpost has only room for the curtest information. And if you deal with Hinduism in exactly twenty pages, and Buddha and Buddhism in twenty-four, you have time only for very general and confident statements. The fact that where one knows most one is least satisfied is somewhat daunting; but, in the circumstances, surely inevitable. For busy people here is a useful introduction; and, if they feel inclined to press on for themselves, a lengthy bibliography will help them.

The Rev. G. Warren Payne, who has been a Wesleyan minister in Australia for over forty years, has now written a short Autobiography in the form of sketches and in the third person. He appears as 'The Preacher' in *From Bark Hut to Pulpit* (Epworth Press; 4s. net).

A volume of Pen Portraits of Early Preachers and Worthies of Australian Methodism has just been published by the Epworth Press. The author is Dr. J. E. Carruthers, and the title *Lights in the Southern Sky* (3s. net).

There is a considerable and increasing activity in Roman Catholic literary circles. Apologetics and expositions follow one another rapidly. And this is all to the good both for enlightenment and criticism. One of the latest productions is also one of the most valuable: *The Philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas*, an authorized translation of Professor Gilson's 'Le Thomisme' (Heffers; 7s. 6d. net). The special value of this exposition for the general reader is that, while he is hardly likely to face the task of mastering the 'Summa,' it is important that he should know what it contains. For the system of St. Thomas lies behind Dante's 'Paradiso,' to say nothing more. Aquinas was the greatest of mediæval thinkers both as a philosopher and a theologian. He was the favourite of Descartes, and our own Hooker was steeped in his thought. And finally he is the philosopher of the Roman Catholic Church, and its greatest pillar. So able an exposition of his teaching, then, as the Paris professor here gives us is welcome. It is careful, complete, and at the same time comparatively brief, and will be read with interest outside the Roman communion.

As beautiful as it is inexpensive is *The Bible Story* as told by Mr. William Canton (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net). It runs to over four hundred pages of large clear type which it is a pleasure to read, and is adorned with sixteen finely coloured illustrations and a map. It tells 'the Bible Story' by giving us a very happy selection—one hundred and thirty-nine in all—of Bible stories, beginning with the Creation and running on to the death of Paul and to John on Patmos. The stories are not told in the language of the Bible, but in a thoroughly modern idiom which, however, has preserved much of the beauty and dignity of the familiar Biblical words. There are some striking exegetical additions and occasional fresh translations. Rahab, for example, is 'a votaress of the evil gods of Heth,' and Elijah is made to say, 'How long will you flutter between two branches?' The story of Jonah is placed between the story of the fall of Samaria and that of

Jerusalem. There is no bias in the selection of the stories; in both Testaments miraculous tales find their place alongside the historical narratives. Occasional phrases or passages might have been omitted, such as the chronological references in the life of Noah or the description of the Tabernacle; but this is, after all, a matter of taste, and such omissions might have savoured of a bias against the priestly writer. Deft imaginative touches appear which have the effect of meeting difficulties occasioned by the Biblical story as it stands in the Bible: e.g. in the Cain and Abel story, 'as the years went past, their wild home'—the home of Adam and Eve—'was filled with troops of children.' Altogether a beautiful and skilful book like this is to be warmly welcomed, and should do something to revive the knowledge and love of the Bible.

The first edition of *The Story of Christ*, by Giovanni Papini, was printed only in March 1923, but we have now got the sixteenth edition. Between March 1923 and March 1924 fifteen editions of this Life of Christ were called for. The sixteenth edition is a pocket one, with purple boards and well printed on India paper. It is a very attractive little volume, and should find even more readers for this Life of Christ (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net).

Dr. and Mrs. Gunn were for many years missionaries of the United Free Church of Scotland in the small island of Futuna, in the Southern Pacific. In *Heralds of Dawn* they give short sketches of the men and women whom they found there. Not only are the sketches interesting in themselves, and interesting from the point of view of missionary work, but they throw considerable light on customs which have now passed away. The book is published by Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton (5s. net).

It is always well to take advice from practical men. And *The Art of Preaching* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net) is by Professor David Smith, D.D., himself one who can draw the people. His book falls into two sections. The first consists of clever skirmishing upon the outskirts of the subject, studies of Greek Rhetoric, and the like. In the second he comes much closer to the facts and needs of to-day, dealing with the preacher in his study, in his pulpit, and among his congregation. The

book is interestingly written, with a marked aptness in quotation.

A book of meditations for a Retreat, from the Roman point of view, has been sent out by Messrs. Longmans—*Societas Christi*, by Mother St. Paul (6s. net). The meditations are founded on the 'Spiritual Exercises' of St. Ignatius, but these are used freely and developed on independent lines. 'Fellowship with Christ' as a title shows the central place of Christ in the thought of the book, and the leading idea is, in fact, that in the great warfare with evil in the world we follow a Divine King who calls us to share His hardships as well as His triumph. How we are to make ourselves fit for this campaign is the burden of these meditations which are deeply spiritual and searching, if a little mediæval in their standpoint.

A perfectly delightful essay in Church History has come from the pen of a distinguished churchman and scholar, Dr. F. J. Foakes Jackson, *Anglican Church Principles* (Macmillan; 10s. 6d. net). The title is inadequate. The book is a history of English Christianity, marked by extraordinary breadth of view and continual suggestiveness. There is nothing laborious about the writing. It is done with ease and mastery, and is always fascinating. The story is traced stage by stage, from primitive Christianity on through the Roman mission, the Normans, and mediæval Christianity to our own day. Naturally we are most interested when we come to the Oxford Movement, Ritualism, and (especially) the 'New Theology.' But what are of more value even than the historical studies here are the reflections of the writer on the history as a whole. One thing he dwells on largely, the continuity we find in the Church. In spite of changes (and it has a genius for adapting itself and learning by its mistakes) it is always the same. There is no doubt that Dr. Jackson loves his mother Church. The second point he makes is that Anglicanism has something which ought not to be given up either to Rome or to Geneva. On the contrary, she is in sympathy with both and is in the position to bring them together. These are not general reflections apart from facts, but generalizations from the history. And those who follow Dr. Jackson through his story will find it difficult to disagree with him. Altogether this is a very good apologetic for the English Church. And those who are outside its

pale will learn much from these pages and enjoy much in them.

A book on systematic giving ought to have a large circulation, especially when it is by a competent layman. This duty is urged with reason, anecdote, and sentiment in *Thine Increase*, by Mr. P. W. Thompson, M.A., member of the Institute of Chartered Accountants (Marshall Brothers; 2s. 6d. net). The task needed doing and it is well done here.

We extend a cordial welcome to the Rev. Dr. D. C. Simpson's book on *Pentateuchal Criticism* (Oxford University Press; 6s. 6d. net), which is a reprint of the volume published ten years ago, with a bibliography which brings the literature relevant to the discussion up to date. The man in the street or the man in the pew, who is never likely to read a more elaborate work like Chapman's 'Introduction to the Pentateuch,' will find here all that he needs to know about Pentateuchal criticism. There is a brief discussion on the History of Criticism, a sympathetic essay on the Meaning of Criticism, and then several very helpful, clear, and not too overloaded discussions of the phenomena which have led to the literary analysis of the Pentateuch into the sources J, E, D, and P, and of the reasons for the dates customarily assigned to these sources, so that incidentally the reader is initiated into the whole process of Israel's historical and religious development. It is a pity that no notice has been taken of some important work that has been done upon the problem since the book was written in 1914, e.g. of Hölcher's discussion of the date of Deuteronomy, or of Eissfeldt's claim to have discovered an early continuous source more secular in spirit than the other, which he has named L (the *lay* source). But perhaps it was well not to encumber with problematic solutions a discussion designed for average Biblical students. These cannot fail to find the book a real help.

A series of brief 'studies' in religious subjects is published by Messrs. Pickering & Inglis under the title *Following Fully* (2s. net). The writer is Mr. William Gilmore, and the titles of the chapters will speak for themselves—'The Bible Infallible,' 'Behold the Man,' 'The Lord's Coming,' and others. They are all marked by orthodoxy and earnestness.

The Bross Lecturer for 1923 was the Rev. M. Bross Thomas, A.M., D.D., and he chose for his subject *The Biblical Idea of God* (Scribners; \$1.50), dealing with it, roughly speaking, in its chronological development. Beginning with the primitive and patriarchal periods as set forth in Genesis, he passes on through the Pentateuch, and the period of the Judges to the Prophets, Psalms, and Wisdom Literature, and ends with the Teaching of Christ and His apostles. Dr. Thomas says many true things about the unity, the personality, and the character of God as apprehended with growing clearness, but the whole discussion would have gained enormously had Dr. Thomas better understood the essentially constructive spirit that animates what he calls destructive criticism. He is afraid of the 'fanciful and theoretic reconstructions' of German scholars, and regretfully admits that 'devout and conservative scholars seem not so well known to the general public as are those whose work is destructive.' He cannot admit that there is any truth in the view that the story of Abraham is the 'idealized account of a later age,' though this was the view of so careful a scholar as the late Dr. Driver. He thinks that the Decalogue implies not monolatry, but monotheism; he regards not only the legislation of Deuteronomy but actually the Song in Dt 32 as Mosaic, and he can quote Is 53 as from a prophet of the eighth century. We fear it is not by such literary methods that historical truth is won. But for those who are ignorant of criticism the book may serve a good purpose by concentrating as it does upon the weighty things that, after all, matter more than the soundest of criticism.

Professor Herbert R. Purinton has written a small but sappy book on the *Literature of the Old Testament* (Scribners; \$1.25), designed to stimulate the reading of the Bible as an integral part of education, and in particular to encourage its intelligent use in schools. In the nature of the case much more attention is here paid to the historical books than to the Prophets or Psalms, as, for the writer's purpose, concrete scenes are of the utmost importance (though among these might well have been included the duel between Amos and Amaziah in Am 7). Not every question that the reader can raise is answered: there will be readers who desiderate a few words more on 'The Scene on Mount Carmel' than they find on

p. 137. But compression was inevitable, and it has its advantages. The writing is decidedly modern—Jeroboam 1., for example, is a 'young labor boss.' Interest in the literary aspect of the Bible is sustained throughout, often by apt illustrative quotations from general literature; and the questions and suggestions which close each chapter will quicken the reader's mind to an independent judgment upon the material. We can well believe that 'the first edition, which was privately printed, was favourably received' by a wide circle of readers in academies, high schools, and Sunday schools.

The problem of the child at church is one that is always with us. The Sunday school does not solve it. The ordinary service in church has not yet solved it. The Rev. A. Lowndes Moir, M.A., thinks that the children's church does. In a charming little book, *The Parish of Lilliput* (S.P.C.K.; 1s. in cloth, and 6d. in paper covers), he describes this institution and its management. It is just a miniature church, with a church council, churchwardens, sidesmen, all the ordinary church activities, finance, sewing parties, and so on. It is managed by the children under the benevolent guidance of 'Clericus.' Those who are interested

in the religious education of the young and yet perplexed about methods of making the church acceptable should read this little book.

A slim volume of addresses to children with the suggestive title *If you Please!* by the Rev. J. J. Knight of Margate, is to hand (Stockwell; 1s. 3d. net). The addresses have been published in response to many requests from those who heard them. This will be their best recommendation. 'Please say Thanks,' 'Please Shut the Door,' 'Please take care,' are the kind of subjects dealt with.

We wish to draw special attention to a little book on *Betting and Gambling*, by the Rev. Canon Peter Green (S.C.M.; 1s. 6d. net). No one perhaps in England knows this subject better than the well-known Canon, and his book is one of the most powerful exposures of gambling in every form and on all its sides we have ever read. It is also a fascinating book to read because of its actual life-experiences. This book should be circulated far and wide, and should certainly be in the hands of all ministers and social workers. It is sane, absolutely well-informed, and entirely convincing.

Paul and Job: A Neglected Analogy.

BY PROFESSOR J. HUGH MICHAEL, M.A., VICTORIA COLLEGE, TORONTO, CANADA.

IN Philippians 1¹⁹ Paul introduces one of his rare allusions to the Book of Job. It is strange that the Book of Job has left but the faintest impression upon the New Testament. Once only—in Ja 5¹¹—does the name of Job occur, and the one possible allusion to the Book in the extant teaching of Jesus is to be found in Mk 10²⁷ and its parallels, and even there the reference is exceedingly doubtful. The only New Testament passage that seems to be universally recognized as containing a quotation from Job is 1 Co 3¹⁹. Peake commenting on Job 5¹³ remarks that 'the quotation from this verse in 1 Co 3¹⁹ is the only quotation from Job in the New Testament,' and Driver also (*I.C.C.*, *ad loc.*) speaks of that verse as 'the only passage of Job quoted in the New Testament.' Some scholars,

however, see an allusion to Job 41¹¹ in Ro 11³⁵. Robertson and Plummer in their note on 1 Co 3¹⁹ (*I.C.C.*) speak of these Corinthian and Roman passages as the only ones in which Job is quoted in the New Testament. We mention these views to show that some scholars hesitate to recognize a reference to Job in Ph 1¹⁹. All that Ellicott admits is that the words concerned 'may have been a reminiscence,' while Findlay (on 1 Co 3¹⁹) remarks that they are 'perhaps an allusion' to Job. This reluctance to find a reference to Job in the Philippian passage is difficult to account for, inasmuch as, apart from everything else, it contains five Greek words (namely, τοῦτό μοι ἀποβήσεται εἰς σωτηρίαν) in exactly the order in which they occur in the LXX of Job 13¹⁶. It is surely gratuitous to say that

there is no quotation. In Philippians the R.V. renders the five words as follows: 'this shall turn to my salvation.'

The precise meaning of these words in Paul is by no means easy to determine and has been the subject of much discussion. Strangely enough, the commentators, almost to a man, scrupulously avoid making any use of Job in their endeavour to discover the meaning of the Apostle. Kennedy (in the Expositor's Greek Testament) is one of the few exceptions, but his words are not many. He finds in Job corroboration for the view that by 'salvation' Paul means his release from captivity. Mackenzie, in the article on 'Philippians' in the *Dictionary of the Apostolic Church*, remarks that the words of Job are 'evidently quoted with the original context clearly in view'; but he makes no further mention of the context in Job. In none of the commentaries within my reach at this moment—and they include Lipsius, Dibelius, and most of the recent English commentaries—is one word said about the context in Job, save only by Kennedy.

The lack of unanimity among interpreters is proof that no one interpretation of the words 'this shall turn to my salvation' compels acceptance on the ground of indisputable probability. There exists no unanimity either as regards the reference of the word 'this,' or as regards the meaning of 'salvation.' Some take 'this' to refer to the Apostle's present situation in its entirety; others find in it a reference to the distress of his soul caused by the propagandism of the preachers whom he condemns in the verses immediately preceding; while others still understand Paul to mean the fact that Christ is being proclaimed. Equally uncertain is the meaning of 'salvation.' Some (including Moffatt in his *New Testament*) interpret it as release from imprisonment. By some it is taken to mean the bracing of the Apostle's spiritual life as he faces his trial, or the remaining stages of his trial, and by others to stand for salvation in the fullest sense, including final glory in heaven. It is doubtful, however, whether any interpretation based upon a combination of these meanings of 'this' and 'salvation' can be said to be wholly satisfactory. It is not our present purpose to discuss these interpretations; we will only remark that the meaning 'release from captivity' for the word 'salvation' seems to be put out of court by the context, which tells us that

Paul was confident that the 'salvation' would ensue whether he lived or whether he died.

It is our purpose rather to point out that in the present passage Paul is conscious of a close analogy between his own case and the circumstances of Job as reflected in chapter 13 of the great drama, and to suggest that the Apostle is applying to himself the words 'this shall turn to my salvation' in the exact sense which they bear on the lips of Job. A fresh paragraph begins with v.¹⁹. 'This' does not refer to anything in the preceding section of the Epistle. It is significant that the Codex Vaticanus introduces v.¹⁹ with δέ, and not with γάρ. Here, as not infrequently elsewhere, that great manuscript may be right as against almost all other authorities.

Let us first note the meaning of the quoted words in Job, and then set forth the points of resemblance recognized by the Apostle between the situation of Job and his own circumstances. If we succeed in showing that Paul is conscious of the analogy between himself and Job, that will go far to justify the view that the Apostle makes the words of Job his own in their original meaning. What do the words mean in Job? Job 13¹⁶ is thus rendered by Driver in the *I.C.C.*:

Even that is to me (an omen of) salvation;
For not before him doth a godless man come.

Buchanan Gray (who writes the commentary on chapter 13 in the *I.C.C.*) explains 'that' to be 'the fact that Job can and does maintain his integrity before God,' and interprets 'salvation' as 'success or victory in his argument with God.' The words of Job, then, in their original context express his conviction, based upon his ability and willingness to plead his cause before God, that he will have victory in his argument with the Almighty and receive vindication at His hands. In other words, his consciousness of innocence makes him confident of vindication. Paul adopts and makes his own the words of Job; in his case, too, the consciousness of integrity—the feeling that he has been in the right in all that has brought him to his present situation—is the ground of his hope of vindication. Whether release or execution be his lot he will be vindicated.

We now turn to consider the indications that Paul has in mind—the analogy between his own case and that of Job. We have seen that an inward consciousness was in the last analysis Job's ground for his confident anticipation of

vindication. Now the Apostle also bases his knowledge that 'this will turn to his salvation' on an inward consciousness, for he declares this knowledge to be 'in accordance with my earnest expectation and hope, that in nothing shall I be put to shame, but that with all boldness, as always, so now also Christ shall be magnified in my body, whether by life, or by death' (v.²⁰). His expectation of vindication, he says, accords with his desire and hope. The feeling of his heart affords ground for his confidence. The analogy with Job is close.

Note that Paul expects and hopes that Christ will be magnified in his body, and he himself vindicated, 'whether by life, or by death.' Here the parallelism is arresting. Job is determined to be vindicated whether he live or die. This is how Driver renders Job 13¹³⁻¹⁵—the words which immediately precede the verse from which Paul takes his quotation:

Hold your peace, let me alone, that I may speak,
And let come on me what will.
I will take my flesh in my teeth,
And put my life in my hand!
Behold, he will slay me; I have no hope;
Nevertheless I will maintain my ways before him.

Be it life or be it death, Job is determined to maintain his ways before God and receive vindication at His hands. In the last line but one of this passage, where Driver renders 'he will slay me,' it is possible to render 'he may slay me.' In any case the reference, as Marti for example argues, is not to any sudden stroke with which the Almighty may visit him for his intrepidity, but rather to the disease that has laid hold upon him. His leprosy was in the eyes of his friends a token of his guilt. But if the Almighty means to let it take its course and issue in death, even so Job is confident of vindication. Paul likens his own imprisonment to Job's leprosy. The issue of the former as of the latter may well be death. The evidence of the whole Epistle goes to show that in his heart of hearts Paul had little hope of any other issue. Like Job, he fully expects that death will be his lot; but, whether it be life or whether it be death, he will be vindicated! Christ will be magnified in his body even if that body has to be surrendered to the executioner.

The phrase 'with all boldness' supplies yet another point of contact with Job. The word used by Paul (*παρρησία*) means literally 'freedom or plainness of speech,' and from that there de-

veloped the meaning of 'courage' or 'boldness,' the freedom from fear which ordinarily accompanies plainness of speech. As Paul is doubtless thinking of his trial, it is possible that he is using the word in its original sense of boldness of utterance; and boldness of utterance is one of Job's main characteristics. Be it life or death he will maintain his cause before the Almighty! Paul will emulate his boldness of speech as he stands before his judges. Is it possible to avoid the conclusion that the analogy is in the Apostle's mind?

The mention of life and death leads Paul to state in the great words of v.²¹ what life and death mean to him: 'For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain.' At present we are only concerned to notice that there is emphasis here on the words 'to me.' What is the explanation of this emphasis? Is the Apostle contrasting himself with the heathen thousands by whom he is surrounded, to whom Christ is unknown and who would regard death as anything but gain? Or is he contrasting himself with his readers, to whom his death would be a loss? It may be that the emphasis is meant to assuage their grief at the prospect of his death: howsoever they may view his death, let them rest assured that *for him* it could only mean gain. We would suggest another explanation of the emphasis. Can it be that Job is still in Paul's mind? He now contrasts himself with the patriarch. If he is to live, Christ will make life an incomparably greater thing for him than life could ever have been for Job if he had been permitted to live. And how immeasurably more attractive was the prospect of death for the Apostle than for the patriarch! Death for Job was not something desirable in itself, but a grim dark thing in spite of which he was confident that he would be vindicated. In an earlier chapter than the one from which Paul quotes in v.¹⁹ Job had said:

Are not the ways of my life few?
Look away from me, that I may brighten up a little,
Before I go whence I shall not return,
Unto the land of darkness and dense darkness,
A land of gloom, like blackness,
A land of dense darkness and disorder,
And where the shining is as blackness
(10²⁰⁻²², Driver's translation).

Is it to be wondered at that there is emphasis on the words 'to me'?

But, some one may ask, is not the reference to Job too vague and casual to convey to the Philippian

Christians the meaning which we suggest the quoted words bore for the Apostle himself? Perhaps it is. Did his words invariably impart to his first readers all that was in his mind? We have positive evidence in the words of 2 P 3¹⁶ that at a comparatively early date Christian readers did not find the Pauline Epistles altogether lucid, and we may be sure that the original readers would oftentimes hold protracted discussions over the significance of some of his statements. It is possible, however, that Paul himself on his first visit to Philippi had made the Philippian Christians familiar with this particular passage from Job; for we know from Ac 16⁴⁴ that after his release from prison he had fellowship with them, and he may well have spoken then of his vindication at Philippi, making use of the words of Job, and thus impressing

this Old Testament passage on the minds of his converts who were for the most part Gentile. It is possible, again, that in a letter addressed to the Apostle the Philippians themselves may have made use of the words of Job. Note that Paul assumes that they are praying that 'this may turn to his salvation' (v.¹⁹). Had they told him that they were praying for his vindication? If they had, may we not think that they had made use of the very expression which Paul employs to express, at one and the same time, both the purport of their prayer and his own confident expectation?

All this goes to show that the words of Job may have been familiar to the Philippians; but, be that as it may, we think we have established the thesis that Paul is noting the points of resemblance between his own case and the situation of Job.

The Massoretic Text and the Septuagint compared, with Special Reference to the Book of Job.

BY THE REVEREND JAMES JEFFREY, D.D., GLASGOW.

THE oldest Hebrew MS. of the Old Testament dates from A.D. 916, and contains the so-called Massoretic (traditional) Text. This represents the standard text arrived at by the labours of Jewish scribes carried on for centuries, and it forms the basis of the Authorized and Revised Versions of our English Bible.

The oldest translation of the Hebrew text is the Septuagint, and it forms an invaluable aid to the study of the Hebrew text. Scholars are at variance as to the origin of this translation. In all probability it was made to meet the desire of the Jews, scattered over the whole world, after the Exile, to possess their sacred books in a form accessible to them. The conquest of the world by Alexander brought it under Greek influence, and Greek became the universal language. Hence the Septuagint.

It is now pretty generally agreed that the translation was made at Alexandria, much frequented by Jews. It was the work of a number of translators, and was spread over many years, from the third to the first century B.C., and was in circulation in the time of our Lord and His Apostles.

The Septuagint follows the Hebrew much more

closely in some books than in others. This is particularly the case with the Pentateuch, while various readings abound in the Septuagint translation of 1 Samuel, the Poetical books, and Jeremiah. The more closely one examines the Septuagint the more it becomes evident that the translators were following MSS differing in many passages from the Massoretic Text, and that some of the translators possessed a more accurate knowledge of Hebrew than others.

We may, I think, assign most of the various readings in the Septuagint to one or other of the following headings:

First.—Additions to the Hebrew text, of which it may be sufficient to note Jos 24³⁰⁻³⁸, 1 K 11²² 12²⁴; in the Book of Esther: the Introduction, 3¹³ 4¹⁷ 8¹³ 10³.

Second.—Passages in the Hebrew text omitted in the Septuagint. To mention only a few of the longest: the Septuagint omits 1 S 17¹²⁻³² 18¹⁻⁶, 1 K 4¹⁷⁻²⁶ 9¹⁵⁻²⁶ 14¹⁻²¹, Jos 8³⁰⁻³⁵.

Third.—The order of chapters and verses differs in the Septuagint from that of the M.T.; a notable instance of this occurs in Ex 36-40 and Jeremiah.

The Septuagint places Jer 46-51 between ch. 25¹³ and 15. This is noticeable in the arrangement of the Psalms. The Septuagint places 10¹⁻¹⁸ in Ps 9 at the close, and reckons Ps 11 as 10, etc.

Fourth.—Differences due to mistaking letters of the Hebrew alphabet closely resembling each other, and owing to the absence of vowel points in the Hebrew. Besides the usual confusing of כ with ס, ד and ר, ז and נ, there are possibilities of confusion between ב and כ; ג and נ; ה, ח, and ט; ס and ש; ק and final ך; ן and ף. To take one or two examples. In Is 9⁸ the Hebrew reads 'the Lord sent a word to Jacob,' the Septuagint reads 'the Lord sent death to Jacob,' reading דָּבָר, 'death,' for דְּבָר, 'word.' In Ex 6¹⁷ the Hebrew reads *Gershom*, and the Sept. *Gedson*, mistaking the ג for ד.

Fifth.—Differences due to imperfect knowledge of the Hebrew on the part of the Greek translators. In Nu 21¹ the Heb. reads *derech halharim*, 'the way of the spies.' The Sept., unable to translate the word for 'spies,' simply transcribes the Heb. word in Greek characters, Ἀθαρείν. In Jg 1¹⁹, where the Heb. has *recheb*, 'chariots,' the Sept. reads *Rechab*, again transcribing the Heb. word in Greek characters. A more striking example of this ignorance of Heb. on the part of the translators occurs in 1 Ch 4²², the last words rendered in Heb. *haddevarim attikim*, 'ancient things,' appear in the Sept. as Ἀβεθηρὶν Ἀθουκίμ.

Sixth.—Most of the differences between the two versions may be traced to the use of the MSS used by the editors of the M.T. and the translators of the Septuagint. Abundant evidence of this will be found as we compare the M.T. of the Book of Job with the Septuagint.

VARIOUS READINGS IN THE BOOK OF JOB.

Of these I have marked upwards of eleven hundred, not including changes in the moods and tenses of the verbs, and in the use of the first and third personal pronouns. Many scholars regard the Sept. as following a more correct text than the M.T., and it furnishes interesting details of Job, his family and friends.

Following the classification of the various readings adopted in dealing with the Septuagint generally, I notice—

First.—Additions to the Hebrew text, of which I can notice only a few of the most striking. The

Sept. adds in 1⁵ the words, 'a calf for the *sins of their souls*,' suggesting a somewhat late date for the Book itself. In 2⁹ there is a remarkable addition to the remonstrance of Job's wife. She represents Job as having said, 'I will endure a little longer, expecting the hope of deliverance,' for behold—she goes on—'thy remembrance is banished from the earth, the sons and daughters of the pains and labours of my womb, for whom I laboured in vain with sorrow. And thou thyself sittest down on corruption, spending nights in the open air, and I wandering with a servant from place to place, and from house to house, expecting when the sun sets that I may rest from my toils and pains which now beset me; but speak some word against the Lord and die.' From 2¹¹ the three friends of Job are designated 'kings,' and in the appendix to the book Job himself is described as the ruler in Edom, testifying to the high place he held among his contemporaries. In 30⁴ the Heb. reads, 'They pluck saltwort by the bushes, and the roots of the broom are their meat,' to which the Septuagint adds, 'but men dishonourable and vile, in want of every good thing, who gnawed the roots of the trees in their great hunger.' The Septuagint adds to 42¹⁷, 'and it is written that he will rise again with those whom the Lord doth raise,' followed by an appendix which some think of a later date; 'This man is interpreted out of the Syriac book as living in the land of Ausis on the borders of Idumæa and Arabia, and his name before was Jobab, taking a wife, by name Arabissa, and begat a son whose name was Ennon. He himself was the son of Zare the son of Esau and of his mother Bosorra, so that he was the fifth from Abraham. And those are the kings who reigned in Edom, of which country he himself was the ruler; first, Balak the son of Beor, and the name of the city was Dennaba, and after Balak Jobab, who is called Job. And after him Asom, who was governor out of the country of Thæman. And after him Adad the son of Barad, who destroyed Midian in the plains of Moab, and the name of his city was Gethaim, and the friends who came to him were Eliphaz of the sons of Esau, king of the Thæmanites, Baldad the king of the Sauchæans, Sophar the king of the Minæans.'

Second.—Passages in the M.T. omitted in the Septuagint. These are not very numerous, and do not affect the sense. To take one or two examples: in 5²³ the Sept. omits 'thou shalt be in league with the stones of the field.' In 12⁴ the Sept. omits 'a

man that called upon God, and he answered him, The just, the perfect man is a laughing-stock.' In 12⁸ the Sept. omits 'I am not inferior to you: yea, who knoweth not such things as these.' In 16⁴ it omits 'I could join words together against you and shake mine head at you.' In 17⁸ it omits 'Give now a pledge, be surety with me and thyself.' In 24¹ it omits 'and why do not they which know him see the days?' In 30⁵ it omits 'they are driven forth from the midst of men, they cry after them as after a thief,' and in 35³ it omits 'that thou sayest, What advantage will it be unto thee, and what profit shall I have more than if I had sinned?'

Third.—Differences due to the re-arrangement of chapters and verses. This occurs in ch. 16, where v.⁸ in the Sept. is v.⁷ in the M.T., and so on to v.²³. In ch. 35 after v.² the Sept. omits v.³ in the M.T., and v.⁴ in the M.T. becomes v.³ in the Sept., and so on to v.⁸. 31³¹⁻³⁵ in the Sept. is 40¹⁻⁵ in the M.T., and further disarrangement occurs to the end of the chapter. 41¹⁸⁻³⁵ in the M.T. is altered to 41⁹⁻²⁵.

Fourth.—Differences due to confusing letters of the Heb. alphabet closely resembling each other, and to the absence of vowel points in the M.T. Thus in 25² the M.T. has 'he maketh peace,' and the Sept. 'he maketh all things'—the translators confusing *shalom*, 'peace,' with a similar word meaning 'a full number.' In 28¹⁸, the M.T. (R.V.) reads 'No mention shall be made of coral'; the Sept. reads 'high things and crystal are not to be mentioned'—translating *ramoth* by *μετέωρα*, the Heb. word meaning both 'heights' and 'coral.' In 34³¹ the M.T. reads 'I will not offend,' and the Sept. 'I will not take a pledge'—*haval* in Heb. having both meanings. In 36¹⁴ the M.T. reads 'their life perishes among the unclean' (marg. R.V. 'or Sodomites'), the Sept. reads 'their life is wounded by messengers or angels.' *Qadesh* means 'Sodomite,' *Qadosh* a holy person, such as an angel.

In 37¹² we have an instance of the difficulty felt by the Sept. translators in understanding the Heb. The R.V. reads 'and it is turned about by his guidance (so they translate the Heb. הַתְּכִינֻהוּ), that they may do whatsoever He commandeth them upon the face of the habitable world.' Unable to make sense of the Hebrew word 'by his guidance,' the Sept. translators rendered in Greek characters, *θεεβουλαθωθ*. Swete in the Cambridge edition of the Sept. offers several conjectures as to the meaning

of the Greek. In 39¹⁸ the R.V. reads 'the wing of the ostrich rejoiceth; but are her pinions and feathers kindly?' (in margin 'or like the stork's?') The Sept. translators, unable to make sense of the Hebrew, read *πτερυξ* *τερπομένων* *νεέλασσα*, *ἐὰν* *συλλάβῃ* *ἀσίδα* *καὶ* *νέσσα*. In Job 36³⁰ the A.V. reads 'Behold he spreadeth his light around him,' the Sept. translators, mistaking the Heb. *oro*, 'light,' for *odo*, read 'he spreadeth *ἡδω* upon it.' In 31⁸ the R.V. reads 'taskmaster,' the Sept. 'tax-gatherer'—the Heb. *noges* having both meanings. In 41¹⁰ the R.V. translates 'the teeth of the young lions,' and the Sept. 'the boasting of dragons' confounding the Heb. *shen* with *shanan*. The Sept. translators were apt to make the same kind of mistake in copying their own Greek MS. Thus in 13¹¹ where one MS. translated the Heb. by *δείνα*, 'excellency' (see Mt 26¹⁸), another writes *δύνα*, 'a whirlwind.' In 18¹² the R.V. reads 'his strength shall be hunger-bitten,' and the Sept., mistaking *sténō* for *στένω*, translates 'let him groan for hunger.'

Fifth.—Differences due to the use of a different text from that adopted by the M.T. To that I think most of the various readings in the Sept. may be traced, but it must be remembered that there is much difficulty in ascertaining the true text of the M.T. in the Book of Job, as is evident from the marginal notes of the R.V. and the conflicting views of scholars as to the true text. I can only call attention to a few instances in which the Sept. differs from the M.T. In Job 1⁶ and other passages where the R.V. has 'sons of God,' the Sept. reads 'angels or messengers of God.' This lends some countenance to the view that in Gn 6⁵ the sons of God are angels. It is also to be noticed that Satan is described as an angel or messenger—a view to which St. Paul seems to refer when in 2 Co 11¹⁴ he speaks of Satan as 'transformed into an angel of light.' In 6⁸ the R.V. reads 'the white of an egg' (margin, or 'juice of purslain'), the Sept. reads 'trifling or insipid words.' This, says Dr. A. B. Davidson, 'is the traditional interpretation and is perhaps the most probable. Others think of some insipid herb, and render: the slime or broth of purslain.' In 12⁶ the R.V. reads 'the tents of robbers prosper, and they that provoke God are secure, into whose hand God bringeth abundantly,' the Sept. reads 'as many as provoke the Lord: as if there were no examination of them.' In 13²⁸ R.V. reads 'like a rotten thing,' Sept. 'like a wine-skin.' In 15¹¹ the R.V. reads 'are the consolations

of God too small for thee? and the word that dealeth gently with thee?' the Sept. reads 'thou hast been scourged for a few of thy sins, thou hast spoken with great arrogance.' In 15²³ the R.V. reads 'He wandereth around for bread, saying, Where is it?' the Sept. reads 'He has been appointed as a prey to the vulture, and he knows in himself that it waits for his corpse.' In 19¹⁷ R.V. reads 'in my mother's womb,' the Sept. 'concubine.' In 19²⁵ the R.V. reads 'But I know that my redeemer (margin, 'or vindicator,' Heb. *goel*) liveth, and that he shall stand up at the last day upon the earth, and after my skin has been thus destroyed, yet from my flesh I shall see God,' the Sept. reads 'For I know that He is eternal who is about to deliver me, and to raise up on the earth my skin, having endured such things, for those things have been accomplished to me of the Lord.' The M.T. suggests the appearance of God as the vindicator, by releasing him from his present affliction, but v.²⁷ suggests the larger hope, that the complete vindication will take place after death, in a future life. In 20¹⁷ the R.V. reads 'Let him not look on the rivers,' the Sept. 'Let him not see the milking of the nomad flocks.' In 22¹² the R.V. reads 'and behold the height of the stars how high they are,' the Sept. reads 'and humbled those carried away by insolence.' In 24¹¹ the R.V. reads 'they make oil

within the walls of these men, they tread their wine-presses, and suffer thirst,' the Sept. reads 'they have wickedly laid snares in a narrow place, they know not the righteous way.' In 33²⁴ the Sept. alters a well-known and much quoted passage. The R.V. reads, 'deliver him from going down to the pit, I have found a ransom,' the Sept. reads 'He will hold him that he fall not into death, he will revive his body as plaster on the wall, and will fill his bones with marrow.' In 38³⁶ the Sept. inserts an interesting addition: the R.V. reads 'who hath put wisdom in the inner parts,' the Sept. adds 'wisdom in spinning to women, and knowledge of embroidery.' Here is another very curious variant reading. In 41⁷ the M.T. as given in R.V. reads 'Canst thou fill his skin with barbed irons, or his head with fish spears?' the Sept. reads 'and everything navigable coming together would not carry the skin of his tail and his head in fishing ships.' There is also a discrepancy between the age of Job. The M.T. gives it as one hundred and forty years, after the restoration of his fortunes (42¹⁶), and the Sept. one hundred and seventy years, and gives the full age as two hundred and forty years (42¹⁶).

Enough has been adduced to indicate how valuable a study of the Septuagint is to the student of the Old Testament.

Recent Foreign Theology.

The Swiss Group.

WE may usefully take Professor Brunner's two books¹ together, for the second is a particular application of the principles stated and argued for in the first. Professor Brunner holds a chair of theology in Zürich, and is probably the ablest of the Swiss group, including Kutter, Barth, and Gogarten, whose provocative work is arousing so much interest on the Continent. It may well be that we are witnessing the first beginnings of a new

movement, the counterpart, and in a sense the antipodes, of the Ritschlian school, dating from fifty years since. The antagonism, however, can only be partial; there are stronger ties of agreement, for example, between Brunner and Herrmann than the former seems willing to recognize.

According to the *Erlebnis*, subjectivism in theology is the enemy. No mistake can be so grave as to keep our eye on the soul (even the Christian soul) in its ups and downs, instead of God and His sovereign grace. Writers like Troeltsch and Heiler, the writer complains, are really more interested in the history of the conception of God than in God Himself. Theology has come to centre in human experiences, in romantic psychology; but faith is no mere inner

¹ *Erlebnis, Erkenntnis, und Glaube*, by Emil Brunner (Tübingen: Mohr, 1923; pp. viii, 132, 4.50 Swiss francs); *Die Mystik und Das Wort*, by Emil Brunner (Tübingen: Mohr, 1924; pp. iv, 396, 12.50 Swiss francs).

process of the soul, it is our response to the transcendent creative Word of God. 'Life' is a term much on the lips of our contemporaries; but life is subordinate to truth, which calls life into being, and when Luther fought the good fight on behalf of justification by faith alone he was in effect protesting that we must be done with subjectivities and cast ourselves upon the God who confronts us in the majesty of the Gospel rather than dwells inarticulately within the arcanum of the soul. The value-judgments of Ritschl are scarcely less objectionable than the psychologism of other men; values and interests are terms that keep the mind moving always within itself. Let us be thorough-going enough to throw off both mysticism and intellectualism, and take our stand simply on faith. The former relativize God in feeling or cognition and never do justice to the reverence that bows the soul in awe before a revealed but infinite God; faith alone places us at the angle at which we can understand words like obligation, guilt, and forgiveness. The malady of present-day theological work is that it starts with man and turns God into an inference from our experience, because it is much keener on harmonizing with culture than in listening obediently to the Divine Word. But faith *begins* with God, by whom we have been apprehended. He has addressed men, not through the mere historical succession of events which the scientific historian may claim to fix and interpret, but through His prophets, and specifically through His Son, the Word made flesh. Faith is insight, not proving God, but pointing to Him in grateful witness.

All this is put with much vigour and with an arresting earnestness of spirit. In a large degree it will be welcomed by all who have grown weary of the psychological virtuoso who has disported himself so freely of late, urging methods upon us as if they were revelations, and all but suggesting that we can tell how the souls of Isaiah and Jeremiah worked and therefore know precisely how much value to put on their convictions. Brunner is no doubt one-sided in his turn. He would deny that faith can in any sense or degree be made intelligible to the outsider; but why, then, do we preach, and why did the prophets deliver a message which they believed would carry conviction to the hearers? He is compelled to admit that trust in a friend is at least *symbolic* of trust in God, and that surrender, the vital heart of religion, is found elsewhere in life. One cannot see why attention to such pre-

paratives for faith need blind us to the creative and supernaturally *sui generis* character of faith when it comes. But his exaggerations are immensely fruitful and stimulating. He ought to be read by all who have time to read him. No one can miss the sheer religious power of his argument, which is hardly the less telling that it often takes a form which is superfluously paradoxical.

His second book, *Die Mystik und Das Wort*, is a frontal attack upon Schleiermacher's influence in theology. Brunner believes him to be the father of all that subjectivism which drags its slow length along the story of nineteenth-century interpretation. With the consciousness of being out on a crusade, he has composed what is unquestionably the most serious indictment of Schleiermacher's thought that has been written for long. The charge is pressed at every point. Schleiermacher as a thinker, it is held, is much more mystic than Christian. He is constantly being put out of his stride by the intrusion of the fact of Christ, but as constantly he recovers himself and will not be diverted. The idea of religion which he brought with him to Dogmatic from his earlier and more philosophical works never permitted him to listen with an unprejudiced mind to what the New Testament and the Reformers were saying. Piety for him is not converse with the sovereign God of redemption, but a process of impersonal forces within the soul, a passive reception of the infinite Causality. As we read him, we are forced to make the protest that Mysticism is not at all the same thing as reception of the gospel, nor is God as Nature identical with God as Spirit. His Christ differs radically from the Christ of history and of faith. The Redeemer acts upon us only as the first source of that stream of Christian life in which we now live and move, at a distance of centuries from Jesus. Sin is atavistic lack of development, not personal guilt. Forgiveness he makes an inference from scrutiny of our own inward state; we are sure of it because we have reflected carefully on the infusion of grace which has changed the balance of forces within our experience—the very opposite pole of truth to the message of the Reformation. Schleiermacher is an evolutionary optimist, with the inevitable result that he naturalizes Spirit and will persist in turning personality in God and man into impersonal tendencies. Significantly enough, he puts the philosophy of history in place of genuine eschatology. Redemption is tuned down

to civilization. Continuity is the watchword throughout; the crises of saving grace are ignored. He has eliminated the conception of moral law and replaced it by the laws of Nature. He speaks of forces where a Christian thinker must speak of the Holy Spirit and of human motives. In truth, he never quite escaped from the shadow of that earlier thought, put with so much startling emphasis in his *Addresses*, that the idea of God, the knowledge of what God is and wills, is no essential element in religion.

Again, a one-sided picture; but the emphatic colours will catch the eye; and in a few years the residuum of truth, which is by no means negligible, will have been carefully ascertained and registered. It may be that Brunner felt he could only get

a hearing for certain truths by uttering them at the top of his voice. Subjectivism is by no means the whole of Schleiermacher, for feeling never was for him a mere state of the soul, as pleasure is; it was in everything but name a mode of trans-subjective apprehension. But few will deny that theologians have as much need to sift out the truth from him as philosophers have from Kant, and in this exceptionally difficult task we need all the aid that Brunner can afford. By this absorbing and formidable book he has made a deep mark in a discussion that has lasted a hundred years and is far from dying down.

H. R. MACKINTOSH.

Edinburgh.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Hide and Seek.¹

'Was lost, and is found.'—Lk 15³².

WELL! that was a real scare, wasn't it? No wonder you are drawing a huge deep breath of relief. For you bigger boys and girls are quite sure you have more than enough already of Ovid, and Cicero (although I loved Cicero), and Livy, especially Livy, so dry and stale and stodgy. And some silly ass, poking about in an old library, thought he had come on heaps more of him, dozens and dozens of fresh books by him. You were in for it, if the thing had really been horribly true. For in all the exams for years and years all the unseens would have been taken from these new and unknown books, and you would never have had a chance of getting a bit you had seen before. It was too bad. But, do you know, the scholars thought that it was splendid, and got as excited and thrilly over it as you did at that football match, when your back just got that fast 'three' upon the very line. They had been hoping all their lives that these books might turn up, and here they really were! Were they? They could hardly believe it; they thought it too good to be true. And so, luckily for you, it was. For the whole thing was nothing but a stupid fake, and you've escaped, and they are disappointed.

¹ By the Reverend A. J. Gossip, M.A., Aberdeen.

But whatever you think about Livy, isn't it hard lines that heaps and heaps of such glorious things get lost, and they never turn up again? We had them, and now they are gone; and we can never get them back now, never any more. You yourself keep losing such splendid things. Why, there's your holiday, all over now and gone. And sometimes you feel quite cross with yourself. For, jolly though it was, you see now how much better even than it was it could have been. There were such lots of things you always meant to do, and yet you never did them; such splendid runs you were to take, and yet you never took them; there was that hill too you were always going to climb, and somehow you didn't; and that ninth hole that you were always going to do in three, and once the ball just stopped at the hole's edge. In? No! a four again! Yet you feel you could do it now. Ah! but it is too late; the holiday is over, and you can't get it back; that's lost.

And you lose bigger things than that. Once on a day you were the cleanest and the straightest of little lads, straight as an arrow—but now? Haven't you grown just a wee bit shuffling when you get into a hole, not quite, quite true. Did you really go up to bed the other night at the time that you promised mother? Or was the book so exciting that you read on to the chapter's end, and then looked into the next one, not to read it, just to see how things were to get on, and found it so terribly

interesting, that you snuggled down, and it was a whole twenty minutes later when you next looked at the clock? I don't think that was very bad. But it was mean and horrid of you not to own up like a man, and tell mother that you hadn't quite played the game. Where is your old straightness? Have you gone and lost it? Oh, don't tell me that! Really? Why, then, we must all get down on our hands and knees and search for it, search everywhere for it, till we come on it. And perhaps you've just mislaid it for a bit, and we may find it yet.

And mother too loses things. She used to have the dearest wee lass, so sunny and bright and unselfish, who never needed to be asked, but saw things for herself and ran to do them. But where is she now? The other day weren't you real cross and grumpy about going that message, trailed off with slow, heavy feet, and such a sulky face? Wherever has that little girl gone that mother used to have? Lost her? And will she never get her back? Oh, what a dreadful pity!

And yet perhaps she may. For there is Some One who is just splendid at finding things, with sharp eyes that see what every one else has missed. And any one who had dropped anything came running to Him, and asked Him to help, and He always did. A mother had lost her boy, and He found him for her; here is a poor soul that had lost his health, and there a stupid woman who had lost her honour, and here again a man, the silly, who had lost himself, and Jesus found them all again for them and gave them back.

Once in a park in Liverpool long, long ago, I came upon a man, walking up and down, with his head bent. 'Have you lost anything?' I asked. 'Yes,' he said, 'but you can't find it for me; I have lost my life.' What a huge hole in his pocket he must have had! Yet he was wrong. If he had only thought of Jesus Christ, He would have found even that for him. And if we go to Him to-day, perhaps He will find that straightness that we have mislaid, and perhaps mother may get back her own little lass again. What do you say to try? He will be sure to help us. The other day, your doll's leg dropped off somewhere in the garden, and you went in a dreadful state and told mother about it. But she was busy, and she wouldn't come and look with you. And that hurt you. For if your leg had fallen off and was lost somewhere in the garden, she would be in a fine fuss

over it. But she didn't seem to care for you—poor you, with your one-legged baby. Jesus never is too busy. 'Oh,' He'll say when we tell Him about the lost wee girl and that straightness of ours we cannot find again, 'That's terrible! there's not a minute to be lost; and we must search at once.' And He'll put everything else aside and come. What do you say? Let's take His hand, and let's start looking with Him; let's begin it here and now. And He won't stop till what was lost is found.

'Swank!'

'For we are God's fellow-workers.'—1 Co 3⁹.

Swank! You boys and girls all know what that means, though it is a word that you won't find in the dictionary. When a boy goes out to take his innings at cricket, looking as if he were the one hope of his side; when he takes a long time getting 'centre,' and looks all round the field to see where the fielders are, as much as to say just watch me knock spots off the bowling, you murmur 'Swank!' And then when he gets bowled, first ball for a 'duck,' you just shout with glee, 'Of course!'

And what about the girls? Why, when Phyllis tells you how many new frocks she has, and all about her best Sunday hat, why you murmur . . . or rather you don't—you're too polite; but you know what 'swank' means, don't you!

Now these people to whom St. Paul was writing were inclined to swank a little. Some of them said, 'Apollos is our leader, and, you know, there's nobody in the world like Apollos.' Others said, 'Well! we don't think much of Apollos, we follow Paul.' And yet others said, 'Peter is the man for us.' And there they were despising one another and refusing to speak to one another, and each lot thinking there was nobody in the world as good as they.

Now St. Paul, when he wrote to them, said, 'We are all fellow-workers.' We each have our bit to do; we work for the same Master; we help one another; and our Master blesses what we try to do. So don't swank! lend a hand, and work together. Now that reminds me of an old legend that I heard many years ago. And this is how it goes.

Once upon a time, the fingers of a man's hand

¹ By the Reverend A. P. Bourne, Dewsbury.

were always quarrelling amongst themselves as to which of them was the most important. The first finger would say he was the best; and the second finger would say, 'No. I am!' and the third finger would say, 'You're both mistaken, I'm better than either of you!' and the little finger would say, 'You're all wrong, there's nobody like me!' Well! things came to such a pitch that at last they agreed that they would have a meeting, and each finger should have an opportunity of stating why he considered himself the most important, and then when they had all spoken they would settle the matter once and for all by vote.

So the day came at last, and because the four fingers didn't think the old thumb would have any chance in the voting they asked him to take the chair. Then the thumb without making a chairman's speech called upon the first finger to speak, and this is what he said: 'Ladies and gentlemen'—(I don't know whether there were any ladies there, but that is what he said)—'We all belong to a single hand, the hand of a man or a woman, and I claim that the finger which is of greatest use to men and women is the most important. Now I am of the greatest use. For when one man wishes to direct another on his way, he always uses me, and pointing with me he says, "That is your way!" If it wasn't for me, therefore, men and women would find it very difficult to point out to one another the right road.' And he sat down.

Then it was the turn of the second finger, and he said: 'I haven't much to say, but what I am going to say is very much to the point. I am the most important of you all for the simple and yet sufficient reason that I stand head and shoulders taller than any of you.' And he sat down. (Now if you happen to be the tallest boy or girl in your class you think that was rather a good speech, don't you?)

Next came the third finger, and he said—or perhaps I ought to say she said: 'I claim that the finger is most important that is most valued by men and women. And that I am that finger I have a clear sign and proof. For often they place a little ring of gold around me. And therefore'—but at that point all the other fingers shouted 'Swank!'

Then the little finger got to his feet, and he said: 'I don't agree at all with the second finger—(of course, *he* wouldn't)—mere size is nothing. And

I only agree partly with the first finger. Certainly that finger is the most important that is of the greatest use to men and women. But it is I that am of the greatest use, not the first finger. For there is no power among men like the power of speech; and when men desire to emphasize what they are saying, they shut all you fingers up, and moving me up and down, they say, "Now listen to me! you must do this, or you must do that." So undoubtedly I'm the most important of you all.' And he sat down.

Then they voted; and when the thumb announced the result, this is what it was: First finger, one vote; second finger, one vote; third finger, one vote; little finger, one vote. You see, each one had voted only for himself!

Then at last the thumb spoke, and this is what he said: 'You're all wrong! we all belong to the hand, and if we are to do our work, we must each do our best, and help one another. Why, there are some things all you four fingers put together cannot do without me.' At that, the fingers were most indignant: as if there was anything in the wide world they could not do without the old thumb! When they challenged him to show them one thing they couldn't do without him, this is what he told them to do, and you boys and girls can try it for yourselves at home. Find the biggest and heaviest book in the house. Lay it flat on the table, and put your fingers under it; only the four fingers mind, not the palm of the hand. Now try to lift it. Well, the four fingers tried: the first finger pushed, and the second finger pushed, and the third finger pushed, and the little finger pushed, and they all pushed together, but the book only toppled over on its side.

'Now,' said the thumb, 'you get underneath again, and I will get on the top. Then, when I give the word you push from underneath, and I'll pull from the top, and we will see what we can do.' So they all pushed and pulled together and the book went up into the air beautifully. Thus the fingers learnt a lesson which they must have remembered ever since, for my fingers never quarrel; do yours?

Boys and girls, you and I belong to God, and we are here in the world to do God's work, and the only way we can do it is for each of us to do our best and help one another. So, however clever we may be, we have nothing at all to swank about, we are just 'God's fellow-workers.'

The Christian Year.

TWENTY-FIRST SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

ARMISTICE SUNDAY:

The Glory of a Nation.

'Thus saith the Lord, Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom, neither let the mighty man glory in his might, let not the rich man glory in his riches: but let him that glorieth glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth me, that I am the Lord which exercise lovingkindness, judgment, and righteousness, in the earth: for in these things I delight, saith the Lord.'—Jer 9²³, 24.

To-day no word of the prophets is of greater value than this word of Jeremiah from the Lord, in which the real glory of a nation is set forth. In what does true national glory consist? Israel and Judah thought that it lay in the possession of three things—wealth, might, and wisdom. A long peace had enabled them to accumulate enormous wealth. They had for that day a large army. Jerusalem was an impregnable fortress, so they imagined. And they had some clever statesmen who had concluded fine alliances or treaties with other powers. Nothing could be better. With such a trinity they were invincible. They made it their boast. Jeremiah brands the whole thing as false. He tells them that their supposed glory was their deadly peril. Their wealth excited the cupidity of other peoples; their army invited a contest; their statesmanship bred craftiness with its train of miseries. And to support his censure, he points to the darkening horizon, and shows that Babylon and Egypt were gathering to the spoil. 'Your true glory,' he cries, 'does not lie in these things, but in another direction altogether. It consists in a spiritual response to God, who stands for loving-kindness, judgment, and righteousness. If you would be secure you must delight in the things in which God delights.' In so speaking to his own people Jeremiah speaks to the whole world and for all time.

It is not necessary to labour the point that wisdom, might, and wealth are real elements in the life of all progressive peoples. We need able men, strong men, rich men, in the fullest content of these words. This trinity of forces can advance a nation's life to an immeasurable degree. Wisdom, might, and wealth, however, are only really useful to a people as they enable it to fulfil its providential mission in the world. And what is that mission? It is to promote those things in which God delights,

namely, 'lovingkindness, judgment, and righteousness.' A nation has no other end than that. All its forces are given to it in order that it may discharge the mission assigned to it by God. For all nations exist by Him and for Him. That is the main truth we have to get home to the human conscience to-day. Each nation is a fraction of a large humanity which has its home upon the earth. But the earth itself is a fraction of something greater—the universe. And neither the separate nation nor humanity as a whole fulfils its mission unless it accomplishes the will of Him who is the Lord of all worlds.

1. Look at *wisdom divorced from God*. By 'wisdom' Jeremiah here means chiefly political sagacity; but the word may be used to cover a larger field. Wisdom amongst a people is a most desirable thing, but when 'wisdom'—whether personal or political—becomes our 'glory,' our boast, and is distended to absurd dimensions, then it offers a great peril to a people. At the very best our fullest knowledge is but relative, partial, ever changing, and a mere fraction of what remains to be known. To make a god of it and to worship it is the most foolish thing conceivable. Knowledge and wisdom—which, after all, are gifts of God to us—are intended for the making of character, and were never meant to be ends in themselves. But no 'character' is worthy unless at the heart of it there is harmony with the eternal wisdom, which, above all else, is marked by loving-kindness.

2. Look now at *might divorced from God*. By 'strength' here Jeremiah intends, primarily, military strength. But, again, we may use the word to cover the entire range of brute force as employed by man. No wise person would make light of the advantages to a nation of a fine physical manhood. It is well that we cultivate the athletic qualities and that we seek to eliminate weakness from the race. But men are slow to believe that strength of this kind is not the highest kind of strength. At the best it is but brute force, which, as life wears on, gradually lessens, until it wholly fails. It is nothing to 'glory' in, when it is remembered that man's highest distinction lies in the mental and spiritual realms. When might of any kind is placed under moral direction it becomes a great auxiliary of justice; but when it is divorced from God, the source of all strength, and becomes a subject of vainglory, then it is turned into an enemy of 'judgment'—a contradiction of that in which God delights.

3. Look also at *wealth divorced from God*. Jeremiah intended by 'riches' not simply private wealth, but national material prosperity. Again, we use the word to cover the entire field. It is both idle and stupid to utter a tirade against wealth, which is inevitable where industry and commerce are efficiently conducted. Wealth has a great mission. By its means the arts and sciences can be developed and beauty cultivated. Placed under the empire of moral ideas, wealth can further the very highest human interests. It becomes a medium for securing human weal—wealth of life, thought, and happiness. But when it is divorced from morality—that is, from God—it is converted into a weapon of injustice; it opposes that in which God delights. Wealth perverted to selfish uses issues in all kinds of crookedness—the opposite of rectitude.

In what does the true glory of a nation lie? In this one thing only—a complete spiritual response to God, who delights in loving-kindness, judgment, and righteousness. This, the prophet says, is to 'understand and know' the living God. The 'knowledge' of God is something far above intellectual speculations about His Nature and His 'essence'; something far above philosophical and credal statements about His mode of being. To know God is to make the practical and affectionate response of the child to the Father, to be one with His purpose, to reproduce His spirit. It is our glory that we can thus know Him, for we are made in His likeness and image, and Christ has come to reattach us to Him. To know Him is more than entering upon an intellectual quest after Him. It is to be penitent, to be trustful, to be obedient, to be co-operative. It is knowledge in life and with living results in life. Nothing is barren in this knowledge; all is vital—it breaks forth as loving-kindness, judgment, and righteousness. A nation 'knowing' God in this manner becomes morally invincible. Its wisdom, might, and wealth do not go astray; they are all placed at the service of God for the service of man. Their uses are moral. Within such a nation, war's injustice, bitternesses, and crookedness automatically cease. There is nothing upon which they can feed. The forces of the nation become constructive, not destructive. We must enthrone the ideal and refuse to abandon it. But we must do more. We are called to enshrine it within ourselves; to adjust our own personal life to the purpose of God; to seek the things in

which He delights. We can do that, whatever others do. Now, tell me, what is it you glory in? A man's boast is the measure of his character. Do you boast in your cleverness, your wisdom, your might, your wealth? And does it not, in this sacred hour, appear paltry and unworthy? Let us vow, from this day onwards, that our sole glory shall be to know the Lord and to delight in those things in which He delights.¹

There's but one gift that all our dead desire,

One gift that man can give, and that's a dream;
Unless we, too, can burn with that same fire
Of sacrifice: die to the things that seem.

Die to the little hatreds; die to greed;

Die to the old ignoble selves we knew;

Die to the base contempts of sect and creed,

And rise again, like them, with souls as true.

Nay (since these died before their task was finished),
Attempt new heights, bring even their dreams to birth,

Build us that better world, O, not diminished

By one true splendour that they planned on earth.

And that's not done by sword, or tongue, or pen,
There's but one way. God make us better men.

TWENTY-SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Forgiveness.

'Seventy times seven.'—Mt 18²².

'Forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors.'—Mt 6¹².

1. *Historic development of the idea*.—As we examine the Old Testament we discover that, though there are isolated admonitions to forgive an offender, as in Lv 19¹⁷⁻¹⁸, 'Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thy heart: . . . but thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself,' the scope of these admonitions is limited absolutely to Israelites or to such strangers as had taken upon themselves the yoke of the Law. 'Neighbour' does not, in the Old Testament, mean any man that you are brought into relation with, as it does in the New Testament. Moreover, side by side with this higher though limited teaching in the Old Testament, there are statements of a very different character, which exhibit the unforgiving temper

¹ F. C. Spurr, in *C.W.P.* cii. 259.

in various degrees of intensity, and yet regard such vindictiveness in a man as compatible with his enjoying the Divine forgiveness. The Psalmist who wrote :

‘ God is mine helper ;

The Lord is with them that uphold my soul :

He shall requite the evil unto mine enemies,’

and closed the Psalm with the expression of sated vengeance :

‘ Mine eye hath seen its desire upon mine enemies,’
(Ps 54⁴. 5. 7),

felt not the slightest hesitation in believing that God had forgiven him and heard his prayers for vengeance on his neighbour. In Ps 112 this revengeful temper is ascribed to the ideal righteous man.

From the Old Testament we pass to the Jewish books between the Old and New Testaments. In Ecclesiasticus we find some slight advance on the Old Testament. There is, however, another work of the second century B.C.—‘Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs’—in which is taught a doctrine of forgiveness in relation to one’s neighbour that infinitely transcends that of Ecclesiasticus and is scarcely less noble than that of the New Testament. In this work the duty of forgiveness is inculcated in the highest form known to us, namely, that of restoring the offender to communion with us—a communion which he had forfeited through his offences. But the author shows that it is not always possible for the man who has suffered the wrong to compass such a perfect relation with the man who has done the wrong, and yet that the man who has suffered the wrong can always practise forgiveness in a very real though in a limited degree, however unreasonable or unrepentant the man may prove who has done the wrong. Here, then, we have arrived at the *first form of true forgiveness*. In this case the man who has undergone the wrong can get rid of the feeling of personal resentment and take up a right and sympathetic attitude to the offender, though he does not for a moment condone the moral wrongness of his conduct. So true forgiveness in this sense is synonymous with banishing the feeling of personal resentment, a feeling which rises naturally within us when we suffer wrong, and which, if indulged, leads to hate. When we have achieved this right attitude towards the offender, got rid of the feeling

of resentment, the way is open for his return to a right relation with us—a return, however, which cannot be effected until the offender has confessed his wrong-doing, and purged himself from the evil spirit which led to it. This banishment of resentment from the heart is the first and essential duty in all true forgiveness, and it is often all that a man can compass ; and apparently the Divine forgiveness has analogous limitations—at all events within the sphere of the present life.

2. *A double significance*.—When we come down to the New Testament, we shall not be surprised that our Lord accepts this teaching—accepts it and yet lifts it up into a higher plane, by showing that human forgiveness and divine forgiveness are essentially one and the same. Our Lord teaches us that we must cherish the spirit of forgiveness towards those who have wronged us, because such must be our spirit if we are truly sons of God. By having God’s spirit we show our kinship with God. ‘Love your enemies,’ our Lord declares, ‘and pray for them that persecute you, that so you may be sons of your Father in heaven.’ And further on the great declaration : ‘For God maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth his rain on the just and on the unjust.’ He teaches that God cherishes no resentful feelings towards His children that have sinned against Him. It is clear, therefore, that in the teaching of our Lord and in that of St. Paul the spirit of forgiveness is an essential attribute of God, and that no expiation, no satisfaction is necessary on man’s part in order to obtain it. All that is necessary on man’s part is true repentance. Without repentance on man’s part God cannot forgive, but if a man, no matter how great or heinous his sin may be, truly repent, he can take home to his troubled heart the comforting assurance that already his forgiveness is sealed in heaven.

We have now seen that as regards both God and man forgiveness has a double significance. A man forgives in the first and primary sense when he puts away from him the sense of irritation and resentment against the man who has wronged him, and entertains towards the offender the spirit of forgiveness. By so doing he shows, as our Lord teaches us, that he is a son of the heavenly Father ; for God has always entertained this spirit of forgiveness towards sinful man. But in the case of both God and man, forgiveness can often be exercised only in this limited form in this world ;

for the offender may refuse to repent, and persevere in his wrong-doing; but till a man is assured of this, he must try to practise forgiveness in its complete form. But forgiveness in the second and full sense of the word is not realized when a man masters his feelings of resentment, and entertains a spirit of forgiveness towards the man who has wronged him. It is something immeasurably larger. It is not realized until the offender is restored to communion with all that is best and Christlike in us. It cannot be satisfied till the wrong-doer has abjured the evil that has created the breach of communion with us, till he is lifted out of the evil spirit of wrongness and restored to communion with what is most Christlike in us, and so far into communion with God. 'If thy brother trespass against thee, rebuke him; and if he repent, forgive him' (Lk 17³); and again: 'If thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone; if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother' (Mt 18¹⁵). This, my brethren, is Christian forgiveness in the full sense; which of us fulfils it?

3. We are now in a position to understand *man's power of binding and loosing*, spoken of in such verses as 'Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven' (Mt 18¹⁸). 'To whom ye forgive anything, I forgive also; . . . what I also have forgiven, . . . for your sakes have I forgiven it in the person of Christ.' Here St. Paul forgives a man, not as an apostle, but as a representative of the congregation, and forgives because the congregation forgives. The reason, moreover, that St. Paul gives as showing it to be their duty to forgive is instructive: 'Forgive him and comfort him, lest he be swallowed up with overmuch sorrow.' Despairing of man's forgiveness, he may despair also of God's. Had the congregation refused to forgive this man, it would have been to shut him out from their love, from their mercies, from the universe of God's love, so far as they were part of it, and thus to close up, so far as they were concerned, the passage of possible return. Thus, instead of remitting his sins, they would have retained them, perhaps to the utter perdition of their unhappy brother. This prerogative of binding and loosing belongs to every Christian as such—that is, so far as he attains to the ideal man.

If we but reflect, we can discover how continually this power is exercised in life by every true

Christian. Who has not known from what a burden he has been delivered when his confession of long-concealed guilt has met with loving sympathy, with human forgiveness, where perhaps he expected rebuke, or even reprobation; and how from this forgiveness he has gained the assurance of Divine forgiveness? ¹

TWENTY-THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Citizenship.

'Our citizenship is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ; who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able to subdue all things to himself.'—Ph 3²⁰.

It is a vigorous, undoubting, soul-sustaining utterance, full of assurance, full of comfort 'when our heads are bowed with woe, when our bitter tears o'erflow'; it is suggestive of the Divine basis of human existence, calculated to reach to the true inwardness of man's being, and lift him above the sorrows, disappointments, and perplexities of life.

There is infinite suggestiveness in the use of the present tense—'is' in heaven, not 'shall be.' There is no suggestion here of heaven as wages to be waited for, or as some celestial dividend-day in the dim and distant future, when God's toilers will receive the accumulated earnings for which they have laboured. There is no sanction given here to the inadequate materialistic conception of heaven as a kind of endless transcendentalized oratorio from the enjoyment of which most human beings are excluded, or an infinitely prolonged celestial idleness.

Mark the authoritative unfolding of the true conception of heaven by our Lord to Nicodemus. He pierces his soul by one mighty word of the Spirit. Nicodemus virtually asks how he is to get to heaven. 'Ye must be born from above' is the answer, that is, from within, for the 'kingdom of heaven is within.' The word used is 'anōthen.' It is nearly the same word as that which the Lord uses of Himself and of His pre-natal being, 'our anōthen,' and the expression, spiritually interpreted, obviously implies that the way to heaven is through heaven, that no man can enter the condition called heaven who has not the heavenly nature awakened within him, and no man could

¹ R. H. Charles, *The Adventure into the Unknown*, 216.

have the heavenly nature awakened within him if it were not already there, embryonic, potential, in germ; that just as the rooting, branching powers are enfolded in the unlovely motionless seed, waiting to be born from above by the vivifying touch of soil, moisture, and sunshine, so the eternal developments of the Spirit of God are enfolded in the human being, awaiting the life-giving touch which shall call them into operative activity.

Underlying this utterance of St. Paul two things may be traced.

1. There is, first, a suggestion as to the strangely contradictory nature of man, a solution of the conflict of which we are conscious within us—'Heaven from whence we look for a Saviour.' Where is heaven? How often are we to remind ourselves that 'the kingdom of heaven is within,' that God is the inmost centre of all things and all men. What can alone change, transfigure this vile body? How is the ugly chrysalis changed into the gorgeous butterfly? Only the uprising within us of the germ of the Christ-nature, the mystic Christ, the Saviour element, the new clothing of the immortal spirit, can transfigure us. This new man is germinally within us now, we have not to wait for it to descend from the clouds; Paul calls it the 'Christ in you,' the Christ-nature, which is the attribute of all men and which was objectively manifested in perfection in the Lord Jesus. We have heard it likened to 'the wedding garment'; we have heard it called 'the armour of God.' Now we have it likened to a 'body,' a new body, a pure and glorious body, a non-atomic enswathment of the immortal spirit, a body like unto His glorious body, and it is to be evolved from the heaven within.

Now, granted that St. Paul is revealing the secret of our ideal humanity, it is from the heaven within that we are to look for this 'Saviour Christ who will change this vile body.' It is not by yearning mental concentration upon the future descent from a distant heaven of a Divine Healer that we are to be changed, while generation after generation of human beings continue unchanged. The whole of the occult saying is in the present tense. It is for us to believe, and to affirm with all our strength, that the Mystic Christ within, the vital reality of our being, which is the God dwelling within us, is now, to-day, at this moment yearning to become a recognized, kindled power in the soul; longing to build us up, to clothe us with the new body, 'like unto his glorious body'; to make us

gradually new men and new women, not by destroying the flesh nature, but by absorbing it, 'making of the twain one new man and so making peace,' and this is the at-one-ment.

What can we do to co-operate with this 'Saviour-Christ nature' dwelling in the heaven within? We can do this; we can assiduously practise ourselves in the conviction that our higher inner consciousness is the life of God within us, the type which was manifested in perfection in the historic Lord Jesus Christ. We can remember that time is not running out for us to annihilation but into development. We can say to ourselves in moments of silent meditation, 'I live because God lives.' We can practise thinking of ourselves as spirit and not as flesh, and, while not despising the 'vile body,' inasmuch as that also has been thought into being by the Omniscient Father, we can avoid concentrating thought on the body. 'Take no thought for your body,' said the Lord; in other words, 'do not be centred on it.' And we can jealously strive to make our bodies pure dwelling-places for the Holy Spirit, the true spiritual ego, the ideal humanity, remembering Paul's words, 'Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?'

2. There is here an assurance of the utter reality of death, the phenomenon upon which we are accustomed to look as 'the King of Terrors.' Death, in human experience, is a fact, and every ascertained fact is an actuality compelling recognition. Death is a real fact, every circumstance connected with which is abhorrent in the extreme. When Jesus said, 'I am the resurrection and the life,' His words had a deeper application than to His glorious power as the objective God-filled manifestation of the Absolute. His words extend to the indwelling divine nature in all men of which He was the perfect specimen. He, the Christ in man, our share of the Logos of God, is the resurrection and the life in each one of us; the life-germ in every grain of wheat might say, 'I am the resurrection and the life' of this seed. We only hate and fear death because our conceptions of life have necessarily been so closely connected with the body. Life, real life, is spirit; real life never dies:

Never the spirit was born;

The spirit shall cease to be never;

Never was time it was not;

End and beginning are dreams.

Birthless and deathless and changeless
 Remaineth the spirit for ever ;
 Death has not touched it at all
 Dead though the house of it seems.

Only the external self dies ; the Jews killed the external self of the Christ, they could not touch His real life. As the Book of Wisdom says : ' The souls of the righteous are in the hands of God, in the sight of the unwise they seemed to die, but they are in peace.' The real citizenship of that one who, to our unwisdom, seemed to die, and to witness whose seeming death was a veritable hell of anguish, is in God ; in God to whom there is no beginning ; and the scope of that life is in God's Eternity to which there is no ending. ' Peace, peace, he is not dead, he doth not sleep, he hath awakened from the dream of life.'

Let us cultivate the assurance that there is no death. Let us believe that they who have gone before, though we miss their dear forms more and more as time goes on, are living, and loving, and watching, and waiting for us. Let us lift the conscious mind, over the narrow threshold, into the citizenship where our beloved are, and while thus seeking communion of spirit with spirit, patiently continue to do our duty here 'until the day break' (the happy day of our own release) 'and the shadows' (the shadows of earthly limitations) 'flee away.'¹

FIRST SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

The Judgment of the Son of Man.

'To stand before the Son of man.'—Lk 21²⁶.

There is one fact of which every Christian is certain, and about which he knows there can be no mistake. Christ must reign. Whatever the future holds, it cannot witness the reversal of the Old Hundredth—'Jesus shall reign.' That is a fact pregnant with promise, a warrant of hope and a pledge of blessing for humanity which make the Advent message a gospel of grace and glory that transcends our utmost aspirations and hopes. But, once believe it, and no man but must feel that it cannot stand alone. It carries with it consequences as certain as itself. We Christians turn back to the words of our Eternal King, and find that with Him Kingship is also Judgment. He who reigns must judge. His throne is the bar

of judgment. Sooner or later each man's life and character are to be brought up before Him as their final arbiter. The last judgment upon every life is the judgment which will be passed upon it by the Son of Man. The scales in which all human history, and the life of every human individual, will be weighed are held by the pierced hands of the Christ of God.

'To stand before the Son of man.' Christ is here pointing a contrast between the standards of judgment that claim finality in the world as we know it and that judgment of men by Himself which He declares to be the goal and destiny of every human life. And this great saying is no isolated instance in His teaching of solemn forewarning about man's future. The Gospels abound in references to His coming, and its significance for men. It is the merest folly to attempt, as some do, to ignore the words of Jesus about the last things : no part of His teaching is better authenticated than that which concerns the End.

Christ leaves unanswered a hundred questions which agitate our minds about the nature of the life of the unseen, where it is to be lived, and how we shall be related to one another in it. He reveals, rather, something which underlies and dominates the answers to all our curious inquiries, and so makes our attitude, both to the here and the hereafter, a matter of vital present importance. After all, for the practical requirements of life, what we need most is not a clear-cut, intellectual creed about the world beyond the grave, but a revelation of spiritual realities. And what can make the spiritual more real to us than this great, simple disclosure of a personal examination of our very selves by Him who offers Himself in His humanity as the supreme standard and living example of what we ought to be? The last word about us is not ours but His.

There can be nothing arbitrary or forced about such a judgment. It is as inevitable and final as is the fact of what we are. It is the coming of our very selves out into the perfect daylight of spiritual reality. There we shall see ourselves at last as God sees us, not as we have appeared to ourselves or to our fellow-men. If we think for a moment of human life, we shall see that we are accustomed to 'stand before' other presences than that of the Son of man, and to judge ourselves and to be judged by other standards than His. Broadly speaking, there are *three standards of judgment* which

¹ B. Wilberforce, *There is no Death*, 29.

we acknowledge and before which we stand every day we live.

1. Each of us knows, first of all, that he 'stands before' *public opinion*. What is public opinion? It is the world's mind about life; the greatest common measure of what men of varied convictions think about something is public opinion about it. There can be no denying the great importance of public opinion to any man's life.

But it is none the less true that public opinion, and not least public opinion upon the vital facts of the spirit, is often hopelessly misguided, and always tends to represent standards which are lower than the highest. Men come to think that, if they keep conduct sufficiently straight to avoid the censure of average judgments, they will pass muster at the last reckoning with God.

2. Then, secondly, narrowing the circle and coming nearer to reality, we 'stand before' our *friends*. It has often been pointed out that few guides to a man's character are so significant as his friendships. But that which is the strength is also the weakness of friendship. The verdict of friends is usually far too kindly. 'Faithful are the wounds of a friend': few of us have the strength to bear them, and fewer still the courage to inflict them.

3. Thirdly, and coming closer still to the truth, we all 'stand before' our *own self-judgment*. The vital fact in man's moral life is the fact of his conscience. But man is a fallen spirit, and conscience itself is broken and bruised by his fall. Few of us realize that one of our deepest needs is an educated conscience, a conscience purified from the taint of sin. In God's judgment of us there is a court of appeal beyond and above our consciences: and we can see that this must be so, if

He is to raise us up to the perfection of His own holiness. St. Paul has spoken the last word about our own self-judgment and its unavoidable limitations: 'I know nothing against myself, yet am I not hereby justified: but he that judgeth me is the Lord.'

This, then, is our Advent certainty. Not public opinion with its fickle convictions, its shifting standards, and its dishonest compromises; not the lax and partial judgments of friends, who condone sin in us and refuse to try us by the measure of God; not even the more severe self-scrutiny of conscience, which has been duped into lowering its ideals by bitter failures, and seduced into doubting the plain warnings of the voice of God within. Not these are the final arbiters upon these human lives of ours, but the Son of Man upon the throne of judgment, the Jesus of the Gospels, human and divine, whom the soul sees with opened eyes to be the very God—perfect goodness, perfect holiness, perfect love. He and nothing less than He, He and He alone, is to try my character, my conduct, myself, when out of this world of dreams and shadows into yonder hereafter, where He reigns and there is none beside Him, I pass to be revealed as I am in the awful radiance of His throne.

How shall we prepare to meet Him? He has told us Himself in words which wrote themselves deep in the memories of His disciples, and were burned so insistently into heart and conscience that, recorded in their Gospels, they have become a guide and a beacon to the Church of all time: 'Watch ye therefore, and pray always, that ye may be accounted worthy to escape all these things that shall come to pass, and to stand before the Son of man.'¹

¹ F. B. Macnutt, *Advent Certainties*, 19.

The Doctrine of the Trinity.

BY THE REVEREND A. D. BELDEN, B.D., WESTCLIFF-ON-SEA.

'I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter.'

'He shall bring to your remembrance all that I said unto you.'—Jn 14¹⁶⁻²⁶.

'If I go not away, the Comforter will not come to you.'

'He shall glorify me.'—Jn 16⁷⁻¹⁴.

THE basis of what is often regarded in these days as the strangest and most enigmatical Christian

doctrine—the doctrine of the Trinity—is to be found in the actual teaching of Jesus. The well-known passage from St. John's Gospel in chapters 14 and 16, the salient features of which are quoted above, would hardly have found a place in even the Fourth Evangelist's narrative if they did not reflect the mind of the Lord.

The baptismal formula, however, at the end of

St. Matthew's Gospel ('in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost') is perhaps no true part of the chapter, but is more likely to be an addition by the early Church, similar to the Doxology added to the Lord's Prayer.

In this passage in St. John's Gospel we have something very much more than a ritualistic formula; we have instead a natural and highly practical reference to the Father, the Holy Spirit, and Jesus Himself, suggesting an identity and equality between the three that could scarcely have occurred to such simple monotheists as the fishermen apostles; and this highly practical statement is the only sure reference to the Trinity in the whole of the New Testament. The well-known passage in 1 Jn 5⁸:

For there are three that bear witness,
The Spirit, the water, and the blood: and
These three agree in one,

is very doubtful as a reference to the Trinity; it refers more obviously and simply to the Atonement.

What we have, then, in the New Testament are constant references by Jesus (25 in number) to the Holy Spirit, and others to the Father and Himself, which carry with them a strong suggestion of equality. In the Epistles we find similar references to God, to the Holy Spirit, and to Jesus together, but with no doctrine of their relations stated, or worked out. The doctrine latent in the assumption that underlies such reference is simply unformulated. This is an important fact, and it is true of other doctrines too.

The New Testament is not a compendium of finished theology; it is much more like a quarry yielding the rough, unshaped raw material of truth, without which, of course, we could do nothing, but which leaves us the inestimable privilege as well as the high task of discovering the right forms in which truth should be presented. Or, to change the metaphor, the theology of the New Testament is fluid, the molten gold of truth, waiting to be poured into the mould of each generation's thought-forms. The Church is led on to the continuous re-statement of saving truth in ever richer and more satisfying forms by the living Spirit of truth. As Jesus said: 'The Holy Spirit shall lead you into all the truth.' At the outset of such a statement as this, therefore, it is deeply worth while to realize that in the course of the providence of God, an age which is making the most thorough and pains-

taking investigation of psychology and personality that has ever been undertaken, is left free to re-state doctrine in modern thought-forms and to work out in more satisfying fashion the implications of the mighty revelation that came to the world in Jesus.

A further aspect of this fact is highly important. The New Testament has first and foremost a *practical* purpose, and one that has to be served in every generation, however great or however small its knowledge and understanding. What a blessing it is, therefore, that the Bible is not the book of fixed and fast theology and petrified doctrine that so many have, all too long, assumed it to be! What a blessing that the glorious truth about it is not its rigidity, but its *fecundity*! The Scriptures are ablaze with a never-fading interest. To quote our great Congregational slogan—'God hath yet more light and truth to break forth from His Word.' Let us then consider the doctrine of the Trinity, first in its origin, then in its classic statement, and finally in its practical values.

I. *The doctrine of the Trinity has its origin in certain indisputable facts and experiences.*—The first disciples came to see that they knew God in three ways. They had been reared in a belief in the one true and only God. They were children of an age, however, which found this God becoming more and more remote, more and more awful, distant, and exalted. They lost sight of Him behind tragic national judgments, and behind the extreme legalism of their national faith. Then *they met Jesus*: and the majesty of His Being, the stainless purity of His character, the self-evident truth of His teaching, and the royal confidence of His claims, made them feel that they were face to face with the Divine in human form. They really did feel that. Peter's confession at Cæsarea is the struggle to express that feeling in the highest language known to him and his fellows. Jesus brought to them the most vivid experience of the Divine they had ever known. But then again, they found Jesus speaking of Another, not the Father, but His Spirit, whom they were to receive. Later, after the stupendous experience of Calvary and the Resurrection, they received the Holy Spirit with astounding effects of moral and spiritual change. This experience sealed in an utterly peculiar way their devotion to Jesus; and yet, all the time, in the background of their thought and feeling, and coming to them with awful nearness by

Jesus and by the experience of the Spirit, was one God, known to them in the language of Jesus as the Father. Their experience of Jesus and the Spirit brought God back in vivid reality into their personal life. There was such a curious identity between these three that the thought of the One was ever bringing to their remembrance the Others, whilst all the time the sense of communion with Absolute Ultimate Deity grew deeper. The first disciples were content to register the facts, they formulated no doctrine, they sought only to launch into other lives their own wonderful experience. Their first aim was intensely practical. The mind of the new Church, however, was essentially active, as the regenerated mind always is, and the need for a theology arose inevitably as the challenge of pagan philosophy asserted itself. Doctrine was bound to come sooner or later, as it is always bound to come. The faith had to be, as it will always have to be, intellectually reasoned and presented. The result, after much development of the Church's thought, was the classic statement of the doctrine in the Athanasian Creed.

II. *The Classic Statement.*—Let me advise the reader to take down his book of (English) Common Prayer and open it at that creed. It is referred to on this occasion only for certain purposes. In the writer's view it is not to be considered binding on any Christian further than it is found to be convincing; but there are at least two things in it that are of great importance—

(a) The emphasis of this classic statement is not only upon the Triune nature of God, but upon His Unity. Athanasius took the greatest possible care to assert the latter. Nothing is easier than to sneer cheaply at this creed as involving the idea of three Gods, but to do so is the greatest travesty of the classic doctrine. Over and over again in the creed you have such statements as the following :

'And yet there are not three eternal, but one eternal.'

'As also there are not three incomprehensibles, nor three uncreated, but one uncreated, and one incomprehensible.'

'And yet there are not three almighties, but one almighty.'

'And yet there are not three Gods, but one God.'

'So are we forbidden to say there be three Gods or three Lords.'

'So that in all things as aforesaid, the unity in trinity and the trinity in unity is to be worshipped.'

(b) The word 'person' needs careful discrimination. It must not be taken to mean individuals—

the three persons are not three different people. Perhaps the term 'consciousness' would get nearer to what Athanasius really meant. What he was striving to express was that there are three WAYS in which we know God. These 'ways' must not be confused; each must be given its full value, and each carries with it the full personality of God. The three ways are in absolute and perfect unity.

There was a heresy called Sabellianism which, playing on this word 'person' as 'manifestation,' taught that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost were three forms of the one God. This sounds all right, but the flaw in the idea was that the forms were *not eternal but transient*. It is of the essence of the classic doctrine of the Trinity that each 'way' in which God exists in Christian experience is everlasting, yet together they are the same God.

Now before the reader gives this up in despair let him consider some simple illustrations taken from human experience that provide *analogies* to this. Our own human constitution presents several parallels. Personality in our experience is the unity of three powers—thought, feeling, will. Each of these is a separate living consciousness carrying the whole self with it. They are not transient forms of the self but abiding realities, though stress may, at any given time, be more on one than on the other. In every act of thought, feeling and will are in some degree present and in the fullest possible degree available. In every act of feeling the same is true of thought and will. In every act of will the same is true of thought and feeling. In every personality, therefore, there are three consciousnesses or 'ways' in which he has his being, yet they make one man; one in three and three in one!

Another fascinating instance of trinity in unity is the constitution of Man as a species. With our usual arrogance we men have called the race 'Man,' but there is absolutely no reason why it should not equally well be called 'Woman.' And what would either Man or Woman signify—at least in relation to each other—if it were not for the 'Child'? How indispensable is any one of these three, yet how perfectly they must unite for 'Man' to attain his best?

But perhaps the best of these analogies from human nature, because the one that approaches nearest to what must be the situation for God, is the state of self-consciousness. Think of yourself

in such a state. The Self is thinking about the Self, but during the operation both of these Selves are bound together by an all-pervading Self. You cannot dispense with a single one of those three factors if the Mind of Man is to exist normally—yet they can just as little be severed from the whole personality—they are not *parts* of the whole self—they are the whole existing simultaneously and perfectly in three ways. *We cannot ascribe to God a Self-consciousness less rich in content than our own.*

A further illustration is one used by F. W. Robertson of Brighton, in his famous sermon on the Trinity, namely, the qualities in a material object such as colour, shape, size. These are three distinct essences or qualities in the object, and in the perfect and undamaged they will all exist together and form one unity, one thing; as, for example, an orange, yet colour is not shape, and shape is not size, and size is not colour. This is a weaker analogy, but it is from a lower form of being than the previous ones. It is one of the laws of being that, in proportion as one rises from lower to higher life, whilst the unity becomes greater, it is always the union of an increased variety in its parts.

That Christian theology is on the track of a great truth here, is supported by the fact that both ancient and modern philosophies have been deeply conscious of the need for some such view of ultimate reality as this. There is a difficulty in thought that drives philosophy towards the trinitarian view. This difficulty was plain to Plato and to Aristotle. The latter, for example, in his teaching that 'philosophical contemplation' is the highest occupation, and therefore the most appropriate activity of God, is forced to ask, 'What does God contemplate?' God cannot be supposed to be adequately occupied by the imperfect, by relative and finite things. Aristotle is obliged to answer: 'He contemplates Himself,' but there he stopped, he could not develop the situation further; and all non-Christian philosophy must come, in its reasoning, to the same impasse. But, as Dr. Illingworth has so ably pointed out in his *Doctrine of the Trinity*, to stop at this point has most mischievous consequences. For example, it leaves no room for the moral nature of God. Aristotle denied moral attributes to God on the express ground of their contingent character, with the result that God for Aristotle remains coldly aloof from real life—a mere abstraction

barely conceivable. But to part company with the moral character of God is to render human morality void of a foundation. All man's goodness is grounded in the conviction that goodness is fundamental reality—an attribute of God. Since we cannot afford to do this, then we must agree with Plato that man's duty 'is to grow as like as may be to God; and that means to become holy, and just, and wise.' But it is of the essence of moral character that it is *social*. Virtue cannot exist and thrive only in our relation to oneself; there must be at least one other for virtue to really 'come alive.'

Consider any great moral attribute such as Love, Justice, Humility. Any one of these things demands at least a minimum of society. They are ways in which persons behave; but as one authority has expressed it, 'a person is as essentially a social as he is an individual being: he cannot be realised, he cannot become his true self apart from society: and, personality having this plural implication, solitary personality is a contradiction in terms.' If we are to think of God, then, as moral and personal, we must acknowledge the value of the Christian revelation that there is a plurality as well as a unity in the Divine Being. Thus we have arrived already at one great practical value of this doctrine. It safeguards the moral character of Godhead. But there are other great gains.

III. *Practical Values.*—(1) The doctrine of the Trinity safeguards the eternal nature of God's revelation of Himself in Christ. The abiding power of Jesus in human thought and life is to be attributed directly to His exaltation above the category of the simply human. It was because men came to *worship* Him that His revelation secured its adequate opportunity. It was because they felt that in Him something of absolute and final value in God was revealed, that He compelled their worship. If Jesus had not been interpreted as of the very essence of the Godhead, He would have been treated as an ambiguous and passing manifestation of the Supreme Power, to the inestimable loss of mankind. It is really everything to us to be able to feel that Jesus is an ultimate revelation of God, that God comes to us personally in Him, and there is nothing in God contrary to Him.

Indeed, it may yet appear that no greater mischief has occurred in Christian history than the tendency to revert to the Old Testament Jehovah when

the revelation of God in Jesus Christ has proved awkward and difficult of application to real life. Has not Jesus too often been treated as a mere interlude between Sinai and the lake of fire and brimstone?

(2) The doctrine of the Trinity perfects our practical apprehension of the power of God in our own life. We all need to discover God in these three ways. We know Him as the TRANSCENDENT, AWFUL, FINAL REALITY of things. The Absolute casts His Shadow over every form of relative being. The height, and depth, and magnitude, and complication of the universe are appalling to our infantile minds. What a pitiful object is the pre-Christian world under the influence of this form of intuitive religious knowledge? Its colossal sacrifice of animal and human life in its attempt to propitiate unseen powers is an eloquent witness. But even to-day upon the godless mind and the godless life there falls repeatedly this awful intrinsic fear of Ultimate Reality. It is traceable in the cult of the mascot, the charm, and the amulet, in the rush after novel forms of religious

belief. The credulity and superstition of this highly rational and unbelieving generation is amazing and pathetic in the extreme. Such a knowledge of God, however, in spite of its element of truth, is not human enough for our salvation. We need to see God as so practically sympathetic with our condition and our need that He descends to a real share in experience of our solid and sordid earth, following us with His love through tragedy, and even red ruin, the companion for love's sake of all our human life that He may redeem and save us, not arbitrarily, but by the winning of our hearts! Even then, however, the salvation of a sinful humanity is not achieved. Our hearts must yield to the *mighty impulse to respond*—to breathe back to Him in ever-increasing love and devotion His Spirit until we know God *by possessing Him*, by in-breathing and out-breathing Him. Thus by these three ways shall we come to the saving knowledge at last of . . .

One God, one law, one element,
And one far-off divine event,
To which the whole creation moves.

Contributions and Comments.

The God of Jesus Christ.

It is perhaps presumptuous for a comparative amateur like myself to call in question conclusions reached by so thorough a student as Dr. A. C. McGiffert; but in the interests of truth, I venture to comment on his recent book *The God of the Early Christians*, noticed in the opening paragraphs of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for August 1924. There is much in the book, as in all Dr. McGiffert's writings, that is informing and stimulating, and set out with much clearness of thought and incisiveness of language; but the first chapter, 'The God of Jesus and of Paul,' appears to me to be in rather painful contrast to his earlier book *The History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, which I have just re-read with profit and satisfaction. He says, 'Since that volume was published, my understanding of Jesus' attitude on certain matters has undergone a radical change, and I am glad to have this opportunity of presenting His thought

about God more fully and more justly.' With deference I offer some reasons for doubting whether his second thoughts are better than his first.

Jesus, he says, 'did not regard it as His mission to promulgate a new God, or to teach new ideas about God.' If he means that Jesus did not deal with the idea of God as a philosopher or theologian, the statement is no doubt perfectly true, and would (I think) be generally admitted. Jesus appears to have been content with the prevailing Jewish idea of God as the 'Lord of heaven and earth, creator and ruler of the world.' The outline of the picture, the intellectual definition of the idea, He left unchallenged. But, if he means that Jesus, and His followers so far as He was able to impart His thoughts to them, *felt* about God as did the Pharisees and other devout Jews of the time, the facts are surely otherwise. While the outline remained, the colour and expression were profoundly altered. Was not the change similar to that in the mind of a boy who has thought of

his father as hard, austere, self-centred, and then suddenly awakes to the depth of love concealed beneath a stern exterior? It is the *experience* of God, not the definition, that really affects a person's life; and to judge of this we must take a larger and deeper view than can be gained by counting the number of times He is called 'Father,' or how often His 'love' or 'forgiveness' is actually mentioned. There is such a thing as not being able to see the wood for the trees.

If Jesus thought of God as did other pious Jews of His time—John the Baptist, for instance—why was His message felt to be a gospel of salvation, and not a mere warning of coming wrath? Why the contrast He draws in Mt 11¹⁶⁻¹⁹ between His own message and that of John? In dealing with Divine forgiveness, is it fair to make a perfunctory mention of the Prodigal Son, and none at all of the Lost Coin or the Lost Sheep, and the 'joy in heaven' when the sinner is rescued? In the light of such passages, or of Mt 5⁴³⁻⁴⁸, what is the value of the statement that 'Jesus makes no specific reference to the love of God in the Synoptic Gospels'? Can these thoughts be matched in the Rabbinic literature? Jesus, as the author here represents him, is altogether too unimpressive a figure to be a *vera causa* for the great religious revolution we call Christianity. Paul and 'John' are greater figures than He is, and see deeper into the spiritual world. I question very much whether this is sound or credible history.

'Jesus had a good deal to say about divine judgment, about gehenna and hell-fire, about weeping and gnashing of teeth, and about the outer darkness. He also pictured God as a righteous but severe judge. . . . He is hard and austere, and He destroys His enemies.' Dr. McGiffert shows no sign that he has even heard of the painstaking study of this subject, in the light of the common eschatological conceptions of the time, by the late Miss Dougall and Rev. C. W. Emmet, published under the title *The Lord of Thought*, and commented on by me in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES of February 1923. He takes all these passages just as they stand as genuine words of Jesus (only noting that they are more frequent in Matthew than in Mark or Luke), never inquires how far they are coloured by the apocalyptic ideas of the Evangelists, never even hints that these prevailing notions of an avenging God need to be taken into account if we are to reach the real thoughts of Jesus. He

seems to be oblivious of Matthew Arnold's canon for the right interpretation of the Gospels, 'Jesus above the heads of His reporters.' On the other hand he rejects the 'revelation' passage from Q (Mt 11²⁷=Lk 10²²), not on any textual grounds, but as 'too closely resembling the Johannine emphasis.' Is not this rather arbitrary criticism?

Has it never occurred to Dr. McGiffert that there may be a deeper meaning in the warnings of 'outer darkness' and the like than the Evangelists had grasped? That Jesus may have seen at least as far as Paul into the immutable laws of the universe—'whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap'—and warned His hearers of the inevitable consequences of sin in such a way that His reporters, for whom natural law meant little, represented Him as attributing these consequences to the arbitrary decisions of a personal Judge? It must be admitted that multitudes of Christians from the earliest times have held thoughts of God as at once saving Father and avenging Judge, which are now being widely felt as contradictory; but is it not at least possible that a teacher who possessed the 'extraordinary religious insight' of Jesus felt the contradiction and avoided it? It seems to me quite incredible that He can have uttered the three parables in Lk 15 and at the same time have held that God has no final way of meeting persistent sin except to use His almighty power for the destruction of sinners.

Only three brief pages are devoted to the Johannine thoughts of God, and no allusion is made to what is surely the deepest thought in the Fourth Gospel—that Christ was Himself the revelation of the Father. To deal with 'the God of the early Christians' and omit the idea that His real nature was revealed in Christ is somewhat strange. The Johannine writer certainly came, as Paul seems very nearly to have come, to the assurance that the character of the unknown God is to be inferred from the lineaments of the person of Jesus Himself: that the real meaning of the confession of the Deity of Christ is that God is of the nature or character manifested in Jesus, and that, therefore, God deals with sin as Jesus dealt with it. This is the assurance that the Church needs to-day if it is to have a real 'gospel of God' for the hungry world. Is it, as Dr. McGiffert's presentation would suggest, not only a thought that the Church at large has never assimilated, but one quite foreign to the mind of the Master

Himself? I cannot myself believe that Paul and 'John' would ever have hit upon it if they had not had a leading from One greater than themselves—either in the body or as interpreting Spirit. Is it not credible that it may have lain very deep in the mind of Jesus—for the most part, it may be, in His sub-consciousness—but that it now and then emerged into conscious expression, as when He spoke of 'revealing the Father,' in the Q passage which Dr. McGiffert rejects? That is represented by Luke as an ecstatic utterance: 'Jesus exulted in the Holy Spirit, and said. . . .' I do not think it possible to judge the real worth, or even the historical emergence, of such expressions by a coldly intellectual scrutiny; psychological insight and quickened sympathy are needed to appreciate them aright. And these are qualities that, in spite of its wealth of learning, one seems to miss in this book. EDWARD GRUBB.

Letchworth.

Simon a Tanner (*Βυρρεύς*) (*Acts* ix. 43, x. 6, 32).

THOSE three references to Simon a tanner awaken in us a desire to know something more about him. Why did Peter go to lodge with him? It can hardly have been a case of paying for his lodgings in the house of a man evidently well known in Joppa. Peter must have had some previous acquaintance with this Simon, and Simon must at least have been in sympathy with the followers of Christ, if he was not a secret disciple.

Why, again, is it stated that his house stood by the sea? The explanations in the 'Expositor's Greek Testament' and elsewhere, that it was perhaps to secure water for the purpose of his trade, perhaps because a tanner was not allowed to carry on his trade unless outside the walls of a town, are not very helpful.

The true explanation, we believe, is to be found in this—that Simon was chiefly occupied in the tanning of *nets*, not hides. Tanning belongs to the business of fishing. The fishermen round our coast still have their nets tanned four times in the course of a year. Simon as a tanner of nets, with perhaps a branch business on the Lake of Galilee, had met Peter there, and probably done business with him at an earlier date. May not Simon on one of his journeys to the Lake have

heard Jesus preach and been one of those whose heart the Lord had touched?

We venture to suggest that this was the reason why Peter went to stay with Simon, and why his house was by the sea. J. McCONNACHIE.

Dundee.

The Lord's Prayer.

WHILE I am fully aware of the strength of prejudice which custom generates, it seems to me to be a duty to urge that we should face truth in connexion with the Lord's Prayer.

If we are not to conclude that our Lord gave two versions, using two words with greatly different meanings, we must decide which is probably the version He gave. The question has to be faced by all who translate this prayer into other languages. My work in the mission field has led me to the conviction that St. Luke gives the true rendering, when he uses *opheilēmata* instead of St. Matthew's *hamartiās*. I conceive that our Lord was aware that His disciples would naturally pray for forgiveness of things they had done wrong—sins of commission, and that, since Christianity was to be a power of positive good, He led them to a higher platform. It was not enough to pray for the forgiveness of wrongs committed. It was not to be enough for the Christian to say, 'I have never done anybody any wrong,' and 'I keep myself to myself.' For a Christian, to fail to be actively good was to play the traitor. It was to fail to be a witness. It was to be numbered not with those who tried to do good and so, not being against us are for us, but to be numbered with those who do nothing, 'those who are not for us are against us.' In the parables of the Unforgiving Servant, of the Rich Man and Lazarus, and of the Judgment, the great sin is shown to be the sin of omission. A Christian who has lost his salt is of no use. A Christian who is not leaven, is worthless. And so, our Lord would teach His followers always to be humble, knowing that when they had done all they were still unprofitable servants, and ever to pray for forgiveness of things left undone—neglected duties. Neglected through blindness, laziness, or wilfulness. The word 'debts' (from the verb 'I owe' or 'ought') could, by teaching, be given its full meaning. Or it might be paraphrased. The matter is of great importance and would

change the entire outlook of the Church of to-day. Christians are far too self-complacent. They seek peace at the expense of truth. Many fear opposition in active good. So they are content if they commit no trespass. We may burke the question in England, through the prejudice of long usage; but it cannot be burked in the mission field.

Further, since the prayer definitely reads *Hōs en ouranois kai epi gēs*, we should do far better by rendering it, 'As in the heavens so (also) upon earth.' This would make the general sense clearer, which, at present, is lost by the insertion of the word 'it.' The prayer is, surely:

| | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Hallow'd be thy name, | } as in the heavens so also |
| Thy kingdom come, | |
| Thy will be done, ¹ | |

The rendering 'Thy will be done in earth, as it is

¹ We know how the present rendering allows people to pray 'Thy will be done in earth,' and, on the ground that 'Thy kingdom come' refers to the end of the world, profess that they do not believe in missions! So in the past could a bishop use the prayer and yet assert that there was no need for missions. To pray 'Thy kingdom come . . . on earth' means that we must work for that for which we pray. Even if the world ends before it is wholly evangelized, our work is plain while it lasts.

in heaven,' is undoubtedly wrong. This is shown by the pause now widely made, at Westminster Abbey, and elsewhere, after the word 'done.'

Why we cannot say 'who art' instead of 'which art' it is not easy to see. We know that there is no relative pronoun at all in the Greek, which, as in Makuchi, is better represented thus: 'Our Father, the in-heaven One.'

The addition of the doxology, taken from the Old Testament, David's prayer, is—as has been frequently pointed out—a mistake. And it is confusing in thought. (The Roman Church does not have it.) It is unmeaning to pray 'Thy kingdom,' and then to say 'Thine is the kingdom.' It can be explained (away), of course. 'Thine is the kingdom on earth (as in the heavens) by right, though on earth we have yet to pray for it, and to work for it.'

Are we ashamed to acknowledge to our people that we can find a better rendering of our Lord's own prayer than that which was made three hundred years ago? Or is it the case that we are so hide-bound by custom that we must refuse progress in our translations at all costs?

WALTER G. WHITE.

Haughley, Suffolk.

Some Expository Studies.

BY THE REVEREND JOHN ADAMS, B.D., INVERKEILOR.

I.

Asking for the Old Paths (Ps. cxxxix.).

THIS fine ode closes with the well-known prayer, 'Lead me in the way *everlasting*.' The suggestion of the Targum, however, is not to be overlooked. It reads: 'Lead me in the way of the *ancients*.' Like Jeremiah, it would ask for the old paths (6¹⁶). Lifting his eyes to heaven the psalmist, in effect, prays: 'Search me, O God, and know my heart; try me, and know my thoughts; and see if there be any wicked way in me, and lead me in the way of my fathers.' This was 'the good old-fashioned way'; and was at least three things in one.

It was characterized by a good old-fashioned *theology*. No one can read vv.¹⁻¹⁸ without feeling this. Philosophical terms like omniscience, omni-

presence, and omnipotence are not heard in its glowing description; yet these are the dominant notes that throb in the first three strophes. Jehovah is the all-seeing, all-filling, and all-controlling presence in the psalmist's thinking and life. One could almost imagine the term 'immanence' trembling on his lips. The ever-pressing influence of his fathers' God was the one thing that mattered. He thought about it in the quiet of evening, and lo, at the hour of dawn, when he awoke from sleep it was still with him (v.¹⁸). No marvel if the experience thrilled him, and elicited the cry: 'Such knowledge is too wonderful for me: it is high, I cannot attain unto it' (v.⁶). This, we repeat, is good old-fashioned theology. It is not expressed in technical theological terms; and yet in emphasizing the presence of our fathers' God, it is

dealing with the one thing that counts. In heart and home, in Church and society, we would hail Him, as the psalmist hailed Him, as the all-wise, all-powerful, and all-loving God.

And it was characterized also by a good old-fashioned *hate* (vv.^{19, 23}). Easy tolerance of evil has no countenance in the strong, virile faith of the Hebrews. Like the poet, it is

Dower'd with the hate of hate, the scorn of scorn,
The love of love.

'The duty of keeping alive in the human heart the sense of burning indignation against moral evil—against selfishness, against injustice, against untruth, in ourselves as well as in others—that is as much a part of the Christian as of the Jewish dispensation' (Stanley). Was it not for lack of this that the whole of Europe, in the aftermath of the Great War, was, and still is, in danger of slipping back into the abyss? An outraged moral sense is allowed to become quiescent in the face of a threatened commercial prosperity. Economics, and not the Decalogue, is to hold the place of honour! Ah, my soul, there will be no peace for the nations, and no safety for the individual man, apart from the withering breath of a good old-fashioned hate.

For, finally, this old Hebrew psalm knows how to enforce the good old-fashioned remedy of *individual amendment* (vv.^{23, 24}). It is easier to castigate national and social evils than to search out and crucify secret sins in one's own heart. But the whole psalm must be read as a unity. Having filled the mind with the vision of an all-seeing and holy God, one is to allow this purifying flame to refine at once the evils of society and the secret faults of the individual life. 'Search me, O God, and know my heart.' Help me in the indispensable task of self-examination! In this way, let me join in the sacred quest for the good old paths. And while I may not be able, in every sense, to rival the wisdom of the ancients, let me join in spirit their goodly company, and share in measure that holy joy of travelling home to God in the way trod by our fathers. I would ask for the old paths!

II.

My Evening Sacrifice (Ps. cxli.).

At the evening hour, when reviewing the experience of the day, the truest worship is the incense

of devotion, the fragrant and sacrificial odour of prayer. One may not be able to join in the stated services of the Sanctuary, but apart from all public forms of worship, he may join the priesthood of believing men, and, lifting his hands, say: 'Let my prayer be set before thee as incense, and the lifting up of my hands as the evening sacrifice' (v.²). It may only be by the family hearth, or in the shaded room of suffering, or in the quiet hour of reminiscence; but in every case the devout heart may turn, priest-like, to the golden altar, and wave its censer, or arrange its prayer, in the presence of the King.

Like the writer of this psalm, it may ask to be protected from the sinister evils that have assailed it during the day. For in word and deed, in thought and fellowship, the believer may be tempted to lower his flag, and jeopardize his faith, in the common ways of the world. There is such an air of good comradeship in its easy-going indifference, and so much playful banter in its commercial and social relationship, that the man of faith does not find it easy to parry its delicate thrusts, and may be conscious at the evening hour that he has not come out with credit from its sifting play of wits. It is foolish enough to listen to the idle talk, and to yield more than is necessary to its maxims and customs; but to be in danger of running to the same excess of riot, whether in meat or drink, is a reflection and possible contingency that can only make one blush! Well may he raise his thoughts at the hour of twilight, and say: 'Incline not my heart to any evil thing, . . . and let me not eat of their dainties' (v.⁴).

Is it possible that he has yielded too much already? Vv.⁵⁻⁷ are not easily interpreted. In gnarled phraseology and in looseness of connexion the passage is too clearly in a state of considerable disorder. And yet out of the confusion, and from the remainder of the psalm, two thoughts are not difficult to distinguish. In v.⁵ there is quite obviously the suggestion that the singer has yielded to the temptation, and been timeously reproved by the pious in Israel. He has drifted so far into the unspiritual ways of the world that pious souls have been grieved by his defection and have privately upbraided him for his careless example. The sting of their reproof may not have been fully felt during the hours of business; but at the hour of twilight, when thoughts come home to roost, he is wise enough to face and acknowledge its

truth. And here is the gracious result. He continues his prayer, saying, 'Let the righteous smite me; it shall be a kindness; . . . (nay) it shall be as oil upon my head' (R.V.). Their gentle rebuke was accepted as a word in season; and it proved to be the oil of his consecration.

And this additional thought is not hard to decipher, that nothing but evil can be the outcome of backsliding in a good man's life. The only thing that ungodly associates can do is to place snares and pitfalls in a good man's path. It was not the first time that at the instigation of evil-doers the bones of the saints had been scattered as at the grave's mouth (v.⁷), and it would not by any means be the last. Even for his own sake, then, if not for the sake of the brotherhood, anything like defection on the part of the psalmist must be resolutely repudiated and banned. My soul, these Old Testament lessons are as applicable to-day as ever. See that you turn to Jehovah when the lamps are lighted, and say in your own behalf: 'Let my prayer be set forth before thee as incense; and the lifting up of my hands as the evening sacrifice.'

III.

A Plea for the Still Hour (Ps. cl.).

The general teaching of this psalm is not difficult to follow. It is a summons to high-sounding praise in the liturgical service of the sanctuary. The whole orchestra of instrumental music known to the Jewish Church is called upon to give volume and depth to Israel's service of praise. 'Praise him upon the loud cymbals: praise him upon the high-sounding cymbals' (v.⁵). All this seemed to be necessary in view of the greatness of the theme. They were celebrating the majesty of *El*, the God of power (v.¹). They were rehearsing the mighty acts and abundance of greatness which had characterized His guidance of Israel through all the chequered experiences of the past. And nothing but tumultuous praise, accompanied by pipe and dance, seemed to be adequate as a fitting expression of a grateful people's joy.

And yet the tiny ode does not close on this high note. It comes to rest on the sacred name *Jah*, the God of covenant love (v.⁶). Probably the psalmist began to feel the reaction from all such public rejoicing, and sensed the need of every devout spirit to get back to the quietude of his own hearth, where, in the still hour of after reflection, he might

taste the deeper and more spiritual joy of meditating on mercy and love. Musing there in quiet receptivity, he might add, what was not so easy in the rapture and swing of public worship—'Let every thing that hath breath praise Jah.' Was the quaint Matthew Henry thinking of a similar distinction when he wrote, 'The best music in God's ears is devout and pious affections: *non musica chordula, sed cor*—not a melodious string, but a melodious heart'? It may have been. An hour comes when, in the quiet of evening, the aid of pipe or timbrel is not needed. A healthy reaction to all public rejoicing has visited the man's soul; and wise is the servant of God who can yield to the soothing influence of the hour and retire and muse in the silence.

Dr. John Ker gives a somewhat amusing reminiscence of Dr. Thomas Guthrie, which may help to illustrate our meaning. He was visiting the great preacher at his Highland home, Inchgrundle, at the northern end of Loches; and in his own felicitous way recalls the Doctor's method of observing family worship. When they had psalms or hymns sung during the day they had the accompaniment of a harmonium, but the instrument was silenced at family praise. He asked the reason, and found that it was an offering to charity. The housemaid, an attached member of the family, belonged to that staunch and worthy section of the Christian Church, the Original Secession, and she had a strong dislike to instrumental music in the service of God! Was that all? Was the silencing of the harmonium an offering to charity, and nothing more? Might it not also be an offering to covenant love? Instrumental music, in our day at least, has a great and worthy place in the public worship of the sanctuary; but times come in the soul's deepest experience, and perhaps family worship is one of these, when the tired servant of God feels no need of any such help. He prefers to utter the holy name of covenant love without it. In any case, celebrating the worthy praise of *El* in the loud sounding music of the sanctuary is but one side of the shield. It is a never-to-be-forgotten privilege; but it is not everything. It is not so heart-moving as the cultivation of the still hour, where one can hymn the even holier melody of the sacred name *Jah*. This is the believer's unique offering to love: not the twanging of the melodious string, but the wooing wonder of the melodious heart. Learn, my soul, to sing thy sweetest Hallelujahs there!

Entre Nous.

SOME TOPICS.

Candour and Reticence.

About a year ago the executors of Mr. J. J. Cooper published a book by him, 'Some Worthies of Reading.' Now some extracts from his letters have been published—*Intimate Letters of a Quaker Magistrate* (Swarthmore Press; 3s. 6d. net). There is much kindliness in the letters, much sound sense, and not a little humour.

'I think a good Quaker personifies the best combination that I know of Candour and Reticence.

'The finest character is that combining them, one who knows the time to speak and the time to refrain from speaking.

'Candour requires a fuller exercise of judgment and charity. Be candid in speaking *to*. Be reticent in speaking *of*.

'Reticence is sometimes both brave and considerate, sometimes moral cowardice.

'“A candid friend” is often a synonym for a caustic critic.

'Candour has probably done more good and probably more harm than reticence.

'Job's friends were more comforting to him during the days of reticence than when they afterwards spoke so candidly to him and about him.

'“Be to his virtues very kind” (and candid),

'“And to his faults a little blind” (and reticent).

'When candour means “speaking the truth in love,” it is altogether beautiful; and when reticence means “I will be silent lest I speak unadvisedly with my lips,” it is just as admirable.'

Popular Preaching.

Byways, by Canon T. A. Lacey (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net), contains thirty-two essays, written in times of recreation. They are not, Canon Lacey says, walks along the high road—the Via Sacra—but rather saunterings in bypaths. 'It must certainly be a very terrible thing to be a popular preacher. The risk is immense; the temptations of the career are overwhelming. He who wins through to safety must be ready, one would think, for beatification. What further miracle can be needed? For consider, in the first place, that popularity has to be acquired. By what

means? Two courses are obvious. The preacher may flatter the prejudices of those present, or may trounce the faults of the absent; during the late war there were, both in England and in Germany, fine opportunities for these methods. A third course is more subtle, but not less promising. He may enlarge on the faults of his hearers, and hold them up to commiseration as victims of circumstances beyond their control. Yet a fourth way is open to him; he may prophesy smooth things in general, with a fine flow of language. Any preacher of ordinary ability may count on winning popularity by these means, and he may count with almost equal certainty on losing his own soul. One other opening there is which may be less dangerous; the method of blood and thunder, with much sound and fury, signifying—nothing.

'Yet, such is the paradox of the Gospel—a preacher ought to desire popularity. How else can he deliver himself in full measure? He has the best of precedents for wishing the common people to hear him gladly. But he will remember that, if he succeeds according to the precedent, his hold will be precarious, and that glad hearing may turn into clamour for his crucifixion. Here, also, there is a prospect of descent into hell, though not for permanent detention. The prospect should not daunt him, or induce him to scorn a temporary popularity. It may, however, check his eagerness to seek the danger.

'Indeed, we seem to have slipped here into an important distinction. To desire popularity is one thing; to seek it is another thing. It may seldom come, except to those who seek, but when it does come unsought the savour is different.'

The Sacrificial Life.

'“The sacrificial life,” Dr. Jowett said, “is life pooled for the public good.” “It is life with the emphasis placed upon our brother.” In this connection he used one of his most famous and memorable illustrations.

'“I was crossing (he said) the shoulder of one of the lower Alps, the Füren Alp, whose bold rocky head looks down into the lovely valley of Engelberg. My guide-book told me that I should reach a place where the visible track would cease,

but it vouchsafed no further information. I reached the place, and with the place the end of the beaten road. For a time I wandered about uncertainly, guided only by the somewhat vague and capricious counsels of a compass. And then I caught sight of what seemed like a splash of blood upon a rock, and then at some little distance another similarly splashed, each one I came to bringing into view another farther away. And then I inferred that these were to be my dumb guides across the trackless waste. I was to follow the blood marks. By the red road I should reach my destination."

"The red road is the path of noblest influence, Jowett urged. The self-crucified man becomes identified—nay, incorporated—with the Lord Jesus Christ. "If the Church of the Living God were sacrificial, she would thrill the world."'¹

A Test of Christianity.

'We need not begin (said Jowett) with prolonged investigation into the length and details of our theological creed. I have known men and women with a creed as long as your arm, but they had no more spirit of venture than a limpet. Their theology is like a mountain, but they have not the courage of a mouse. Our jealousy for orthodoxy is no proof at all of the value of our faith. What do we hazard for it? The measure of the hazard reveals the vitality of our faith, and nothing else reveals it. It is not revealed by our controversial ardour. It is not revealed by our stern guardianship of orthodox spoils. It is not revealed by the scrupulous regularity of our attendance at Church and worship. No, all these may mean nothing at all. What do we hazard for Christ? What have we staked on the venture? How much have we bet that He is alive and King? Twopence a week, or our life? That's the test.'²

POETRY.

J. S. H.

Two small volumes of devotional meditations have been published by one of our Indian missionaries. He does not give his name, but signs the foreword J. S. H. The titles of the books are *The Fourfold Sacrament* and *The Sacrament of Common*

Life (Heffer; 2s. 6d. net each). They are the result of his own daily practice of the presence of God. It was his custom—first, to fix his mind on some aspect of the Divine Fatherhood; second, to bring the day's tasks before God; third, to express thankfulness to God; and fourth, to remain in joyful communion with God. We quote from the *Sacrament of Common Life*:

THE SACRAMENT OF SONSHIP (Fourth Week).

Bábar,
Emperor of Hindustan,
Being caught, with his army,
By a destroying blizzard on the Hindu Kush,
Came at last with his men to a little cave,
But would not himself be safe therein,
Because there was in it no space for his men;
Rather he chose to abide without, in the storm
and the frost,
With those whom he counted his brothers and
friends.

So also,
O Master divine,
Thou dwellest not far and at ease in a lazy heaven:
But endurest with us, whom Thou countest Thy
friends,
The brunt of the storm,
Bearing all that we bear,
Sharing the toil and the strife,
Steeling our hearts to be strong
By the joy of Thy presence.

THE SACRAMENT OF SONSHIP (Twenty-Ninth Week).

No sadness is there, nor care,
For those that love Him:
Suffer they may, die they must,
Yet trusting and holding Him,
They are content.

For His love is stronger than death,
More patient than pain:
When my soul shall escape from the final shattering
agony,
Then, ah then, shall He put forth His might,
And make me His own for ever.

¹ Arthur Torritt, J. H. Jowett, C.H., D.D., 224.

² *Ibid.* 206.

Must I wait till that day?
 Nay, one thing alone do I need,
 That, a little child,
 Here and now I may put forth my hand in the
 darkness,
 And be grasped by His love—

Grasped, did I say?
 Nay, my soul shall be stormed,
 Mastered with strength resistless,
 Garrisoned fast by the armies of God,
 By immortal and heavenly joy in His love.

Studdert Kennedy.

A new and revised edition of some poems, by the Rev. G. A. Studdert Kennedy, has been issued by Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton (6s. net). The title—*The Sorrows of God*—is taken from the first poem. Many of them bear a message from the war, and we select two of these:

IF YE FORGET.

Let me forget—Let me forget,
 I am weary of remembrance,
 And my brow is ever wet,
 With tears of my remembrance,
 With the tears and bloody sweat—
 Let me forget.

If ye forget—If ye forget,
 Then your children must remember,
 And their brow be ever wet,
 With the tears of their remembrance,
 With the tears and bloody sweat—
 If ye forget.

WASTE.

Waste of Muscle, waste of Brain,
 Waste of Patience, waste of Pain,
 Waste of Manhood, waste of Health,
 Waste of Beauty, waste of Wealth,

Waste of Blood, and waste of Tears,
 Waste of Youth's most precious years,
 Waste of ways the Saints have trod,
 Waste of Glory, waste of God,—
 War!

A TEXT.

Ps. xviii. 19.

'These words came into my mind some weeks ago when I was sailing up the Thames. It was to me an unfamiliar stretch of waters. Everything was strangely beautiful. The trees that lined the river banks; the frequent glimpses into the recesses of dark woods; the occasional breaking of the lines, and the surprising vistas of open country; the play of the waterfowl; little children paddling here and there, and their shouts of joy; in quieter places the songs of birds! It was very beautiful. And then we left it all and were shut up in a lock. We were imprisoned within stone walls and iron gates. Not a green thing could be seen. Not a bird could be heard. But in our imprisonment we began to rise. Shut in, we began to be lifted up; until, when we reached the appointed height, the forward gate swung open and we continued our journey on a higher level. And all this became the parable of common experiences in human life. Who does not know God's locks along the river?'

This is from *Springs in the Desert* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net)—devotional studies in the Psalms by the late Dr. J. H. Jowett. These meditations have been collected so that nothing of his may be lost, for Dr. Jowett had a place of his own, and we shall not soon see his like again.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works,
 and published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street,
 Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings
 Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.